arXiv:1601.06691v1 [math.DS] 25 Jan 2016

MINIMAL GEODESICS AND INTEGRABLE BEHAVIOR IN GEODESIC FLOWS

JAN PHILIPP SCHRÖDER

Abstract. In this survey article we gather classical as well as recent results on minimal geodesics of Riemannian or Finsler metrics, giving special attention to the two-dimensional case. Moreover, we present open problems together with some first ideas as to the solutions.

1. Introduction and structure of this paper

When Poincaré first studied the stability of the solar system in the 19th century, he studied the dynamics of what is nowadays known as a monotone twist map of an annulus. A central step was to find reasonably nice sets in phase space that are left invariant under the dynamical system in question. These sets were remnants of integrable behavior of the dynamical system, the approach leading in particular to the development of KAM theory, as well as Aubry-Mather theory.

It was found that Poincaré's monotone twist maps are related to geodesic flows on the 2-torus. In this setting, the geodesic flow of a Riemannian metric of constant curvature on a closed, orientable surface can be seen as an "integrable" prototype of a dynamical system. Morse and Hedlund observed that minimal geodesics with respect to any Riemannian metric resemble in many senses the "integrable" behavior of the constant curvature case.

Basic results on minimal geodesics date back to the 1920ies, while some were established recently. Studying the structure of the geodesic flow, minimal geodesics have proven to be useful and hence can be the first step towards understanding geodesic flows as a whole. In this survey, we will summarize results on the structure of minimal geodesics, with special attention towards the 2-dimensional case. Central topics include asymptotic notions, such as asympotic directions of minimal geodesics, the stable norm and Mather's average action, the Gromov and horofunction boundaries, weak KAM solutions, chaotic behavior, transitivity and topological entropy. Along the way, we present some indications for further research, some of which might be suitable for PhD projects.

We include proofs in this paper if they are simple and illustrate the ideas involved or because the proofs have not yet appeared in the literature. Please be aware that it is not the aim of the author to give a complete overview on the literature.

Contents

1. Introduction and structure of this paper 1
2. First examples, setting and basic definitions 3
2.1. An example 3
2.2. Basic definitions 4
2.3. Minimal geodesics 6
2.4. Model geometries 7
2.5. Hadamard manifolds 10
3. Asymptotic directions for rays 11
3.1. The Gromov boundary of Hadamard manifolds 15
3.2. Asymptotic directions of rays 15
3.3. The width of asymptotic directions 16
4. Dominated functions and weak KAM solutions 17
4.1. Directed weak KAM solutions 21
4.2. Horofunctions 23
4.3. Injectivity of the asymptotic direction 25
5. Mather theory 25
5.1. Weak KAM solutions in Mather theory 31
5.2. Mather's avarage action 33
6. Rational directions 34
6.1. Structure of rational rays in 2 dimensions 34
6.2. Oscillating local minimizers in 2 dimensions 36
6.3. 2-dimensional cylinders 38
6.4. Rational directions in higher dimensions 42
6.5. Multiplicity of shortest closed geodesics 46
7. Irrational directions 48
7.1. The genus one case 48
7.2. The higher genus case 49
8. Applications to Mather theory, weak KAM solutions and average actions 51
8.1. The genus one case 51
8.2. The higher genus case 59
9. Topological entropy 64
9.1. The entropy of minimal geodesics 64
9.2. Geodesic flows with vanishing entropy 65
9.3. Zero-entropy surface diffeomorphisms 70

10. Miscellaneous results 72
10.1. Invariant graphs and contractible geodesic loops 72
10.2. Surfaces of non-positive curvature 74
11. Dynamical systems related to geodesic flows 76
11.1. Monotone twist maps 76
11.2. Tonelli Lagrangians 77
11.3. Symplectic geometry 79
References 80

2. First examples, setting and basic definitions

2.1. **An example.** We briefly discuss the dynamics of the geodesic flow of the rotational torus embedded in $\mathbb{R}^3$. In the example of the rotational torus, many phenomena in the study of minimal geodesics already occur.

One can show that the rotational torus is isomorphic to $\mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$ endowed with a Riemannian metric g' of the form

$$g'_{(x_1,x_2)}(v,w) = f(x_2) \cdot g(v,w)$$

with some smooth, positive function $f : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$, g being the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and the quotient $\mathbb{T}^2$. The function f has precisely two extrema, one minimum corresponding to the short inner loop and one maximum corresponding to the longer outer loop. Rewriting g' as a Jacobi metric $g' = (e - V)g$, i.e. setting

$$f(x_2) = e - V(x_2), \qquad e := \max f, \quad V(x_2) := e - f(x_2) \geq 0,$$

we find that the geodesics of g' are reparametrized solutions $c : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{T}^2$ of the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$(c_1'', c_2'') = \ddot{c} = -\operatorname{grad}_g V(c) = (0, -V'(c_2))$$

with total energy $E(c, \dot{c}) = \frac{1}{2}|\dot{c}|_g^2 + V(c) = e$.

In this way, one sees that the geodesics c of g' have a linear c_1-component and behave like solutions to the pendulum-like equation $x'' = -V'(x)$ in the c_2-component. In particular, the geodesics c *stay within finite distance of a straight line*, when lifted to the universal cover $\mathbb{R}^2$ of $\mathbb{T}^2$. Drawing a transverse figure of the geodesic flow, one obtains the well-known phase portrait of the simple pendulum: There are smooth, *invariant graphs* over the x-axis and in the middle there is a fixed point (the *short inner geodesic loop*) connected to itself by

homoclinic orbits forming a pair of continuous, invariant graphs, surrounding an elliptic fixed point (the outer long geodesic loop) and orbits oscillating around it.

2.2. **Basic definitions.** We fix some notation. Throughout, we fix a connected, simply connected, smooth manifold H of arbitrary dimension and endow H with a fixed, complete Riemannian metric g. (H will usually be a Hadamard manifold, hence the letter H.) We write $|v|_g = \sqrt{g(v,v)}$ for the norm of the Riemannian metric g. We let Γ be a discrete group of g-isometries acting freely on H, which is assumed to define a smooth quotient manifold

$$M = H/\Gamma$$

of the same dimension as H. In particular, H is the universal cover of M and Γ is isomorphic to the fundamental group $\pi_1(M)$ of M. The boundary is automatically $\partial M = \emptyset$ by the completeness of the g-geodesic flow. The covering map is denoted by

$$p : H \to M,$$

reserving the letter π for the canonical projections of the (co)tangent bundles

$$\pi : TH, T^*H \to H, \qquad \pi : TM, T^*M \to M.$$

Periodic curves in M in some homotopy class $\tau \in \Gamma$ correspond to curves $c : \mathbb{R} \to H$ satisfying

$$\exists T > 0 : \qquad \tau \circ c(t+T) = c(t).$$

Such curves will be termed τ-periodic.

We shall work with Finsler metrics, thus incorporating monotone twist maps of the annulus, as well as Riemannian metrics and general Tonelli Lagrangians, see Section 11. We recall the definition of a Finsler metric; for an introduction to Finsler geometry see [BCS00].

Definition 2.1. *A* Finsler metric *on H is a function $F : TH \to \mathbb{R}$ with the following properties:*

(i) F is C^∞ in $TH - 0_H$, 0_H being the zero section,
(ii) $F(v) \geq 0$ for all v,
(iii) F is positively homogeneous of degree one, i.e. $F(av) = aF(v)$ for $a \geq 0$,
(iv) (strong convexity) there exists a constant $c_F \geq 1$, so that if $v \in TH - 0_H$ and $w \in T_{\pi v}H$, then

$$\frac{1}{c_F^2} \cdot |w|_g^2 \leq \frac{d^2}{dt^2}\bigg|_{t=0} \tfrac{1}{2}F^2(v+tw) \leq c_F^2 \cdot |w|_g^2.$$

F is called reversible*, if $F(-v) = F(v)$ and* Riemannian*, if $F(v) = \sqrt{g'(v,v)}$ is the norm of some Riemannian metric g'.*

The reader unfamiliar with Finsler metrics may assume throughout that F is Riemannian.

We fix in this paper the Finsler metric F on H, assume that F is invariant under Γ, so that both F and g descend to metrics on the quotient M, denoted again by F, g. Observe that F is uniformly equivalent to the norm of g. Namely, taking $w = v$ in the definition of strong convexity, we have

$$\frac{1}{c_F} \cdot |v|_g \leq F(v) \leq c_F \cdot |v|_g.$$

The unit tangent bundles $\{F = 1\} \subset TM, TH$, respectively, are denoted by $S_F H, S_F M$ and the geodesic flow of F will be denoted by ϕ_F^t. Given a vector $v \in TH$ or TM, the F-geodesic with initial condition $\dot{c}(0) = v$ of constant speed is denoted by c_v, so that $\phi_F^t v = \dot{c}_v(t)$. Similarly, the g-geodesic with initial condition $\dot{\gamma}(0) = v$ is denoted by γ_v. Throughout, F-geodesics will carry Latin letters, while g-geodesics will carry Greek letters. The Finsler metric F induces a length structure

$$l_F(c; [a,b]) = \int_a^b F(\dot{c}) dt$$

on the space of continuous, piecewise C^1-curves $c : [a,b] \to H$ or M. Using this length, we can define the F-distance

$$d_F(x,y) = \inf\{l_F(c; [0,1]) : c(0) = x, c(1) = y\}$$

on H and M. Note that the metrics d_F and d_g are equivalent by the same constant c_F as F and g.

We shall be treating the geodesic flow of g as given and the dynamics of the F-geodesics as unknown. In the example of the rotational torus in Subsection 2.1, (H, g) is the Euclidean plane, Γ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $F = |.|_{g'} = \sqrt{f} \cdot |.|_g$ is the norm obtained from the embedding as the rotational torus in the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^3$. Already in this example, KAM-tori occur.

Definition 2.2. *Let $\phi^t : X \to X$ be a C^∞-flow on a C^∞-manifold X. A* C^k-KAM-torus *(of dimension n) is a C^k-submanifold $\mathcal{T} \subset X$, such that*

(i) $\mathcal{T}$ is invariant under ϕ^t,
(ii) there exists a C^k-diffeomorphism $\mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{T}^n = \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{Z}^n$ conjugating $\phi^t|_{\mathcal{T}}$ to a linear flow ψ^t on $\mathbb{T}^n$ of the form

$$\psi^t(x) = x + t\rho \mod \mathbb{Z}^n.$$

We call the flow ϕ^t integrable*, if* X *is filled up to a set of zero Lebesgue measure by* C^∞*-KAM-tori.*

The smooth invariant graphs in the case of the rotational torus are all C^∞-KAM-tori. The rotational torus yields an example of an integrable geodesic flow. To be precise, we also make the following definition.

Definition 2.3. *A* graph (over M, H) *in* TM, T^*M, TH, T^*H*, respectively, is a subset* G*, so that the canonical projection* $\pi|_G$ *is injective.*

2.3. **Minimal geodesics.** Write $\mathbb{R}_- = (-\infty, 0]$ and $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$.

Definition 2.4. *An arc-length* C^1*-curve* $c : \mathbb{R}_-, \mathbb{R} \to H$ *with* $t = d_F(c(0), c(t))$ *for all* $t \in \mathbb{R}_-, \mathbb{R}$ *is called a* ray, minimal geodesic*, respectively. The sets of initial conditions* $v \in S_F H$ *of rays, minimal geodesics are denoted by* $\mathcal{R}_-, \mathcal{M} \subset S_F H$*, respectively. We shall also call geodesics* $c : \mathbb{R}_-, \mathbb{R} \to M$ *rays or minimal, if they lift to rays or minimal geodesics in the universal cover* H*. The sets of initial conditions are in this case the projections* $Dp(\mathcal{R}_-), Dp(\mathcal{M}) \subset S_F M$*.*

We defined rays and minimal geodesics in the universal cover. Equivalently, a geodesic $c : [a, b] \to M$ lifts to a minimal segment in H, if for all $a \leq s < t \leq b$ and all curves $c' : [0, 1] \to M$ with $c'(0) = c(s), c'(1) = c(t)$, which are homotopic in M to $c|_{[s,t]}$ have $l_F(c') \geq l_F(c)$. Hence, rays and minimal geodesics in M are homotopically minimizing.

Everything that we say will of course have an analgon to rays defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$. In order to avoid confusion, rays in this paper will be defined on $\mathbb{R}_-$. Rays defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$ will be termed forward rays, defining a set $\mathcal{R}_+ \subset S_F H$. Note that we often drop mentioning F when speaking of minimal segments. In our applications, g will usually be of non-positive curvature, so any g-geodesic is automatically minimal in H.

A typical assumption will be that M is orientable. Note that results on rays and minimal geodesics in the orientable case carry over directly to the non-orientable case, as they are defined in the universal cover. If M is non-orientable, one can move to the orientable double cover $\tilde{M}$ of M and write $\tilde{M}$ as a quotient $H/\tilde{\Gamma}$ with $\tilde{\Gamma} \subset \Gamma$.

Two central questions govern this paper.

(A) How does the restricted geodesic flow $\phi_F^t|_{\mathcal{M}}$ resemble the geodesic flow ϕ_g^t, i.e. being given some structure of ϕ_g^t, what is the structure of $\phi_F^t|_{\mathcal{M}}$? Here, the flow ϕ_g^t takes the place of a simple, "integrable" model of ϕ_F^t.
(B) What are the implications for the whole geodesic flow ϕ_F^t, and how large is the set $\mathcal{M} \subset S_F H$?

A large part of this paper will be concerned with the intersection properties of rays. Let us be precise.

Definition 2.5. *Let $c : I \to H, c' : I' \to H$ be two curves defined on intervals I, I'. Then c, c' have* successive intersections*, if*

$$\exists s < t \text{ in } I, s' < t' \text{ in } I' : \qquad c(s) = c'(s') \text{ and } c(t) = c(t').$$

Let $c, c' : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ be two rays. Then c' intersects *c, if $c'(s) = c(t)$ for some $s \leq 0$ and some $t < 0$, but $\dot{c}'(s) \neq \dot{c}(t)$.*

The necessity for considering *successive* intersection stems from the Finsler metric F not being reversible in general.

The following lemma excludes in particular successive intersections of rays and shows that asymptotic rays cannot intersect in the sense of Definition 2.5. The idea of the proof is classical, see Theorem 6 in [Mor24]. Another proof can be found in [Sch15a], Lemma 2.20.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $v_n, v, w_n, w \in \mathcal{R}_-$ with $v_n \to v, w_n \to w$, $\pi w = c_v(a)$ for some $a < 0$, but $w \neq \dot{c}_v(a)$. Then for all $\delta > 0$ and sufficiently large n*

$$\inf\{d_g(c_{v_n}(s), c_{w_n}(t)) : s \in (-\infty, a], t \in (-\infty, -\delta]\} > 0.$$

2.4. **Model geometries.** We discuss here some classical instances of the Riemannian manifold (M, g). We will in this paper mainly be concerned with the 2-dimensional case $\dim M = 2$. A typical assumption will be that M is moreover orientable and compact, hence closed. Then M is a handle body, that is the connected sum of the 2-sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ 2-tori $\mathbb{T}^2$. The integer $\mathfrak{g} \geq 0$ is the genus of M. There exists a Riemannian metric g on M of constant curvature $K_g \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$. In the case $\mathfrak{g} = 0$, the universal cover $H = \mathbb{S}^2$ is compact and there are no rays or minimal geodesics at all. Hence, we will assume that $\mathfrak{g} \geq 1$.

If $\mathfrak{g} = 1$, then M is the 2-torus $M = \mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$ and $K_g = 0$. We take $H = \mathbb{R}^2$ and g the Euclidean metric.

The g-geodesics in $\mathbb{R}^2$ are straight lines $\gamma_v(t) = \pi v + tv$. Here we find invariant graphs for the geodesic flow, i.e. in coordinates $T\mathbb{R}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ the sets

$$\Sigma_\xi := \{(x, \xi) : x \in \mathbb{R}^2\} \subset S_g\mathbb{R}^2$$

for $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| = 1\}$ are invariant under the g-geodesic flow. Observe that all geodesics γ_v with $v \in \Sigma_\xi$ have the same (asymptotic) direction $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$.

The group $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}^2$ acts by translation $\tau(x) = x + \tau$ for $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. The direction of g-geodesics is invariant under the action of $\tau \in \Gamma$ and the sets Σ_ξ descend to ϕ_g^t-invariant graphs $Dp(\Sigma_\xi) \subset S_g\mathbb{T}^2$. Moreover, the

projections $Dp(\Sigma_\xi)$ are KAM-tori for ϕ_g^t in the sense of Definition 2.2, so that $\phi_g^t : S_g\mathbb{T}^2 \to S_g\mathbb{T}^2$ is an integrable geodesic flow. If $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$ has rational or infinite slope $\xi_2/\xi_1 \in \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}$, then all geodesics in $Dp(\Sigma_\xi)$ are closed under ϕ_g^t. If, on the other hand ξ has irrational slope $\xi_2/\xi_1 \in \mathbb{R} - \mathbb{Q}$, then any geodesic $\gamma_v(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{T}^2$ with $v \in Dp(\Sigma_\xi)$ is dense. Motivated by this duality, we will consider the set

$$\Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2} := \{\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 : \xi_2/\xi_1 \in \mathbb{Q} \cup \{\infty\}\}$$

to be the directions of periodic g-geodesics.

Let us now assume $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$. Then $K_g = -1$ and we take for (H, g) the Poincaré disc model of the hyperbolic plane. That is,

$$H = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| < 1\}$$

is the open unit disc endowed with the Poincaré metric

$$g_x(v, w) = 4 \cdot (1 - |x|^2)^{-2} \langle v, w \rangle,$$

writing $\langle ., . \rangle, |.|$ for the Euclidean metric in $\mathbb{R}^2 \supset H$.

The g-geodesics are circle segments in $\mathbb{R}^2$ meeting the boundary $\mathbb{S}^1$ orthogonally. In particular, g-geodesics $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to H$ have two endpoints $\gamma(-\infty), \gamma(\infty) \in \mathbb{S}^1$. In S_gH we find ϕ_g^t-invariant graphs of the form

$$\Sigma_\xi^- := \{v \in S_gH : \gamma_v(-\infty) = \xi\}.$$

Hence, the geodesics from Σ_ξ^- initiate in $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and spread all over H. Geodesics γ_v, γ_w with $v, w \in \Sigma_\xi^-$ are asymptotic in the sense that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} d_g(\gamma_v(\mathbb{R}_-), \gamma_w(-t)) = 0.$$

In particular, the sets $\gamma_v(\mathbb{R}_-), \gamma_w(\mathbb{R}_-)$ have finite Hausdorff distance. (In the literature, γ_v, γ_w are sometimes called asymptotic, if the Hausdorff distance is finite. We shall reserve the term "asymptotic" for the strong sense above.)

The group Γ consists of isometries of (H, g). The group $\mathrm{Iso}^+(H, g)$ of orientation-preserving isometries consists of Möbius transformations $\tau : H \to H$ of the form

$$\tau(x) = \frac{ax + b}{\bar{b}x + \bar{a}}, \qquad |a|^2 - |b|^2 = 1$$

(using the complex structure on $\mathbb{R}^2 \cong \mathbb{C} \supset H$). Using this formula, each element of $\mathrm{Iso}^+(H, g)$ extends to the boundary $\mathbb{S}^1$ and each element in $\mathrm{Iso}^+(H, g) - \{\mathrm{id}\}$ has either one or two fixed points in $H \cup \mathbb{S}^1$. The group Γ acts freely on H, so that we exclude the case of a fixed point in H (such isometries are called elliptic). Then the set $\Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$ splits into



FIGURE 1. Top: The action of $\tau \in \Gamma$ in the Poincaré disc H. Bottom: The situation in M. Left: The action of a parabolic isometry $\tau \in \Gamma$ yields a cusp in M. τ rotates along the horocycles attached at the fixed point in $\mathbb{S}^1$. Right: The action of a hyperbolic isometry $\tau \in \Gamma$ yields a closed geodesic in M. τ translates along the geodesic connecting the fixed points in $\mathbb{S}^1$ and expands (contracts) the horocycles attached at the unstable (stable) fixed point.

parabolic elements having one fixed point in $\mathbb{S}^1$ and *hyperbolic* elements having two distinct fixed points in $\mathbb{S}^1$. We write

$$\Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\} = \Gamma_{par} \,\dot\cup\, \Gamma_{hyp}.$$

The parabolic elements correspond to cusps of infinite length in the quotient $M = H/\Gamma$, while a hyperbolic element τ defines (up to orientation-preserving reparametrization) a unique arc-length g-geodesic $\gamma_\tau : \mathbb{R} \to H$ by the property

$$\exists T > 0 : \qquad \tau \circ \gamma_\tau(t+T) = \gamma_\tau(t).$$

Hence, $p \circ \gamma_\tau : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is the unique closed geodesic in the homotopy class τ. The fixed points of τ are given by the endpoints $\gamma_\tau(\pm\infty)$ and by our convention, $\gamma_\tau(-\infty)$ is stable, while $\gamma_\tau(\infty)$ is unstable. See Figure 1 for the action of Γ corresponding to the topology of M. Not assuming M to be compact, but only (M, g) to be an orientable, complete Riemannian surface with curvature $K_g \equiv -1$, the group Γ can contain parabolic elements. If we use the assumption that M is compact, then M cannot have cusps, i.e. $\Gamma_{par} = \emptyset$.

The foliation of S_gH by the sets Σ_ξ^- could be seen as integrability in the universal cover. However, the end points $\gamma(-\infty)$ and hence the graphs $\Sigma_\xi^- \subset S_gH$ are not invariant under the group Γ, as was the case for $\mathfrak{g} = 1$. Hence, the sets Σ_ξ^- do not project to KAM-tori for ϕ_g^t in M the sense of Definition 2.2. It is well-known that the geodesic flow ϕ_g^t is ergodic with respect to the canonical Liouville measure in S_gM, if (M, g) has finite volume (in particular, if M is compact). In particular, almost every orbit $\dot\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to S_gM$ is dense in S_gM and the geodesic $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to M$ has many self-intersections. The set $Dp(\Sigma_\xi^-) \subset S_gM$ is never a graph over M.

Again we define a set Π_M by

$$\Pi_M := \{\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 : \exists \tau \in \Gamma_{hyp} \text{ with } \tau\xi = \xi\}.$$

Hence, Π_M corresponds again to the endpoints of geodesics projecting to closed geodesics via $p : H \to M$. For $\xi \in \Pi_M$ the sets Σ_ξ^- are invariant precisely under the infinite cyclic subgroup of Γ generated by the elements fixing ξ (see the Preissmann theorem in Subsection 2.5).

The following definition is motivated by the case of the 2-torus.

Definition 2.7. *If $M = H/\Gamma$ is a closed, orientable surface of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 1$, then the points in $\Pi_M \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ are called* rational. *The points in $\mathbb{S}^1 - \Pi_M$ are called* irrational.

Of course, if the genus of M is $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$, then the points in Π_M will not have rational slope.

2.5. **Hadamard manifolds.** A Hadamard manifold is a connected, simply connected manifold H endowed with a complete Riemannian metric g of non-positive curvature. We briefly recall four theorems in this setting. Firstly, the topology of H is simple.

Theorem 2.8 (Hadamard-Cartan)**.** *H is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^{\dim H}$.*

Secondly, geodesics with finite Hausdorff distance are excluded by negative curvature. More precisely, one has the following.

Theorem 2.9 (Flat Strip Theorem [EO'N73])**.** *If $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 : \mathbb{R} \to H$ are two unequal geodesics, whose images $\gamma_0(\mathbb{R}) \neq \gamma_1(\mathbb{R})$ have finite Hausdorff distance, then γ_0, γ_1 bound an embedded strip $S \cong \mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$ in H of positive width, which is totally geodesic and the curvature of (S, g) vanishes.*

The fundamental group of a negatively curved, closed manifold (M, g) cannot be abelian.

Theorem 2.10 (Preissmann)**.** *If the quotient $M = H/\Gamma$ is compact and if the sectional curvatures of g are all strictly negative, then any subgroup of Γ is infinitely cyclic, i.e. isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$.*

Finally, negatively curved, closed manifolds (M, g) have an ergodic geodesic flow.

Theorem 2.11 (Hopf, Anosov)**.** *If the quotient $M = H/\Gamma$ is compact and if the sectional curvatures of g are all strictly negative, then the geodesic flow $\phi_g^t : S_gM \to S_gM$ is ergodic with respect to the canonical Liouville measure. In particular, almost every g-geodesic is dense in S_gM. Moreover, the set $\mathrm{Per}(\phi_g^t)$ of periodic orbits is dense in S_gM.*

One way to generalize Hadamard manifolds is to assume that the Finsler metric F on H does not have conjugate points. We recall the notion of conjugate points along an arc-length F-geodesic $c : \mathbb{R} \to H$ (equivalently $c : \mathbb{R} \to M$). For $v \in S_FH$ we write $V_v = \ker D\pi(v) \subset T_vS_FH$ for the vertical line bundle. Then two points $x_0, x_1 \in c(\mathbb{R})$ are *conjugate along* c, if there exist times $t_0 < t_1$ with $x_i = c(t_i)$, such that for the geodesic flow

$$D\phi_F^{t_1-t_0}(\dot{c}(t_0))V_{\dot{c}(t_0)} = V_{\dot{c}(t_1)},$$

cf. Figure 2. It is well-known that, if the Riemannian metric g has non-positive curvature, then it has no conjugate points. If (H, F) has no conjugate points, the theorem of Hadamard-Cartan still holds. Moreover, all geodesics are minimal,

$$S_FH = \mathcal{M}.$$

Recall in this connection Question (B) in Subsection 2.3.

3. Asymptotic directions for rays

The main result in this section, Theorem 3.1, is referred to as the *Morse Lemma* in this paper. Note that in the literature there is also a Morse Lemma for smooth functions. The theorem to which we refer as the Morse Lemma has nothing to do with this.

Theorem 3.1 (Morse Lemma)**.** *Let (M, g) be either the flat 2-torus $(\mathbb{T}^2, euc)$ or have sectional curvatures bounded from above by some constant $-a^2 < 0$. Let F be any Finsler metric on M (recall that F is uniformly equivalent to g). Then there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ depending only on F and g with the following property: If x, y are any two points in the universal cover H and if $c : [0, d_F(x, y)] \to H$ is*



FIGURE 2. An orbit $\dot c$ of the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t in the unit tangent bundle, together with the vertical line bundles $V_{\dot c}$ under the action of $D\phi_F^t$. The planes are the transverse sections of ϕ_F^t given by the kernel of the Liouville 1-form (i.e. the contact structure). Here we see the situation $D\phi_F^{t_1-t_0}(\dot c(t_0))V_{\dot c(t_0)} = V_{\dot c(t_1)}$, i.e. two conjugate points along c. Projecting to H via π yields a geodesic variation of c, which intuitively focuses at the conjugate endpoints $c(t_0)$ and $c(t_1)$. The arrows at $V_{\dot c(t_i)}$ indicate how the geodesic flow twists $V_{\dot c(t_i)}$.

a minimizing F-geodesic segment from x to y, then for the (unique) g-geodesic segment $\gamma_{x,y} \subset H$ from x to y we have

$$\max\{d_g(\gamma_{x,y}, c(t)) : 0 \le t \le d_F(x,y)\} \le C.$$

Hence, F-minimizing geodesics shadow g-geodesics in a uniform fashion. In this paper we will often work with the assumption that *the Morse Lemma holds*. In this case we mean that we are given H, g, F, so that the assertion in Theorem 3.1 is satisfied.

Theorem 3.1 appeared first as Lemma 8 in Morse's work [Mor24] in the case of a surface of genus at least 2. Hedlund observed in [Hed32] that it holds also for the 2-torus. Zaustinsky [Zau62] observed that the metric F does not have to be Riemannian or even reversible. The proof in higher dimensions in the case of manifolds with a negatively curved background metric g was given by Klingenberg in [Kli71]. By an example of Hedlund [Hed32], Theorem 3.1 is false even for $M = \mathbb{T}^n$ with $n \ge 3$.

We shall sketch the proof of Theorem 3.1 in the two situations, which will be very different.

Sketch of the proof of Theorem 3.1, hyperbolic case. This is the case of an upper bound for the sectional curvatures. The proof of Klingenberg in [Kli71] is basically the same as in [Mor24]. First observe that by using Rauch's comparison theorems, one can in essence assume that (H, g) has constant sectional curvatures $-a^2$. Intuitively, if the curvature is below that, all estimates become more extreme. Let us assume $a = 1$, the general case being analogous. We follow [Mor24].

Step 1. There exists a constant $r = r(F, g) > 0$ with the following property. Suppose $\gamma \subset H$ is a g-geodesic and $c : [t_0, t_1] \to H$ is a C^1-curve with

$$d_g(\gamma, c(t_0)) = d_g(\gamma, c(t_1)) = r \leq d_g(\gamma, c(t)) \qquad \forall t \in [t_0, t_1],$$

and moreover, projecting $c(t_0), c(t_1)$ to points $x_0, x_1 \in \gamma$ via the unique g-geodesics orthogonal to γ, we assume

$$d_g(x_0, x_1) > 1.$$

Then $l_F(c; [0, 1]) > d_F(c(0), c(1))$, i.e. c is not minimal.

Proof. Let $c_r : [t_0, t_1] \to D$ be a curve from $c(t_0)$ to $c(t_1)$ in constant g-distance r from γ. Hyperbolic geometry tells us that

$$l_g(c) \geq l_g(c_r) = d_g(x_0, x_1) \cdot \cosh(r).$$

The uniform equivalence of F and g in the sense $\frac{1}{c_F}|.|_g \leq F \leq c_F|.|_g$, $d_g(x_0, x_1) > 1$ and the triangle inequality then show

$$\begin{aligned} d_F(c(t_0), c(t_1)) &\leq c_F \Big(d_g(c(t_0), x_0) + d_g(x_0, x_1) + d_g(x_1, c(t_1)) \Big) \\ &< c_F(2r + 1) \cdot d_g(x_0, x_1) \qquad (1) \\ &\leq \frac{c_F^2(2r + 1)}{\cosh(r)} \cdot l_F(c). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing r so that $\frac{c_F^2(2r+1)}{\cosh(r)} \leq 1$ proves the claim. □

Step 2. The theorem holds with

$$C = r + c_F^2(2r + 1).$$

Proof. Let $c : [0, d_F(x, y)] \to D$ be a minimal segment from x to y and let γ be the g-geodesic joining x, y. Suppose that $d_g(\gamma, c(t_*)) > r$ for some t_* and let $t_0 \leq t_*$ be maximal with $d_g(\gamma, c(t_0)) = r$ and $t_1 \geq t_*$ be minimal with $d_g(\gamma, c(t_1)) = r$. From Step 1 and the minimality of c we find for the orthogonal projections x_0, x_1 of $c(t_0), c(t_1)$ to γ, that $d_g(x_0, x_1) \leq 1$. Again by minimality of c and (1),

$$l_F(c; [t_0, t_1]) = d_F(c(t_0), c(t_1)) \leq c_F(2r + 1).$$

Hence, we find

$$\begin{aligned} d_g(\gamma, c(t_*)) \leq d_g(x_0, c(t_*)) &\leq d_g(x_0, c(t_0)) + l_g(c; [t_0, t_1]) \\ &\leq r + c_F^2(2r+1). \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows. □

□

The proof in the torus case involves several steps and we will be more sketchy than in the hyperbolic case. We follow the ideas of Hedlund [Hed32], see also [Sch15a] for the general Finsler case.

Sketch of the proof of Theorem 3.1, case of the 2-torus. 1. This is a topological statement. Let $c : \mathbb{R} \to H \cong \mathbb{R}^2$ be a continuous, τ-periodic curve for some $\tau \in \Gamma \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$. Assume that τ is an iterate of some τ_0, i.e. $\tau = \tau_0^k$ for some $k \geq 2$. Then c can be decomposed into k τ_0-periodic curves.

2. If $c : \mathbb{R} \to M$ is a shortest closed geodesic in the homotopy class $\tau = \tau_0^k$, then it is the k-th iterate of a shortest closed geodesic in the homotopy class τ_0. For this one uses the decomposition from the first step: all curves in the decomposition have to be "short" and hence their translates cannot intersect transversely.
3. It follows from Step 2 that shortest closed geodesics in homotopy classes lift to minimal geodesics in the universal cover H: Shortest closed geodesics in the class τ become shortest in τ^k after iteration, for all $k \geq 1$, such that the geodesics are minimizing on arbitrarily long subsegments.
4. Prove that there exists a constant $r = r(F, g) \geq 0$, such that, given any $\tau \in \Gamma$, all τ-periodic minimal geodesics stay at distance at most r from a τ-periodic Euclidean straight line.
5. Let $x, y \in H$ be arbitrary. Then there exist $\tau, \tau' \in \Gamma$ and a τ-periodic minimal geodesic $c : \mathbb{R} \to H$, such that x, y lie in the strip bounded by $c(\mathbb{R})$ and $\tau' \circ c(\mathbb{R})$. Then any minimizing segment connecting x to y cannot exit the strip between the two τ-periodic minimal geodesics, as this would imply successive intersections of minimizers (Lemma 2.6). By Step 4, $c(\mathbb{R}), \tau' \circ c(\mathbb{R})$ lie in r-distance from a Euclidean straight line. By controlling the size of τ', one infers the theorem.

□

Remark 3.2. Observe that Steps 1 to 3 in the last proof also work in the case of a higher genus surface M, where (H, g) is the Poincaré disc; observe that here the group generated by τ_0 is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$.

This proves that if M is a closed, orientable surface, the shortest closed geodesics in free homotopy classes are minimal geodesics.

3.1. **The Gromov boundary of Hadamard manifolds.** We recall the definition of the Gromov boundary of a Hadamard manifold (H, g), first introduced in [EO'N73]. Let (H, g) be a Hadamard manifold, let $v, w \in S_g H$ and let $\gamma_v, \gamma_w : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ be the corresponding g-rays. We render v, w equivalent if the Hausdorff distance of the sets $\gamma_v(\mathbb{R}_-), \gamma_w(\mathbb{R}_-)$ in (H, d_g) is finite. The *Gromov boundary* is the set of equivalence classes and will be denoted by

$$\mathrm{Gro}_-(H, g) = \mathrm{Gro}(H, g).$$

The equivalence class of a ray $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$, respectively a vector $\dot\gamma(0)$ will be denoted by $\gamma(-\infty) \subset S_g H$. It can be shown that for each $x \in H$ and each $\xi \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ there is a unique g-ray γ from ξ to x, i.e. with $\gamma(-\infty) = \xi, \gamma(0) = x$. Hence, $\gamma(-\infty) \subset S_g H$ is a graph over H. We can make the same definitions with forward rays $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_+ \to H$, defining a Gromov boundary $\mathrm{Gro}_+(H, g)$.

We endow $\mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ with a topology. Given a sequence of points $\{\xi_n\}$ in $\mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$, which is a sequence of subsets of $S_g H$, we write $\xi_n \to \xi$ if for some (hence for all) $x \in H$ the arc-length g-rays $\gamma_n, \gamma : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ with $\gamma_n(-\infty) = \xi_n, \gamma(-\infty) = \xi$ and $\gamma_n(0) = \gamma(0) = x$ satisfy $\dot\gamma_n(0) \to \dot\gamma(0)$ in the usual topology of TH. In this way, $\mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ becomes homeomorphic to the unit sphere,

$$\mathrm{Gro}(H, g) \cong \{v \in T_x H : |v|_g = 1\} \cong \mathbb{S}^{\dim H - 1}.$$

The group Γ acts on $\mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ by

$$\tau(\gamma(-\infty)) := (\tau \circ \gamma)(-\infty).$$

If M is a closed, orientable surface of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 1$, the Gromov boundary is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{S}^1$. In Subsection 2.4 we defined for $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ the graphs Σ_ξ (if $\mathfrak{g} = 1$) and Σ_ξ^- (if $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$). It is easy to see that these are precisely the graphs in $S_g H$ occuring as points $\gamma(-\infty) \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$. We identify

$$\mathrm{Gro}(H, g) \cong \mathbb{S}^1 \qquad \text{via} \qquad \Sigma_\xi, \Sigma_\xi^- \cong \xi.$$

If $\mathfrak{g} = 1$, then the Group Γ acts on $\mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ only by the identity. If $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$ then the Group Γ acts on $\mathrm{Gro}(H, g) \cong \mathbb{S}^1$ by the Möbius transformations discussed in Subsection 2.4.

3.2. **Asymptotic directions of rays.** Assume that (H, g) is a Hadamard manifold and that the Morse Lemma, i.e. Theorem 3.1 holds. Due to the uniformity if the constant $C = C(F, g)$, we can associate to

each F-ray $c : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ a g-ray $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ having distance at most C to c and vice versa. We define the *asymptotic direction* of c by

$$c(-\infty) = \gamma(-\infty) \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g).$$

If c is a forward ray, we define analogously $c(\infty) = \gamma(\infty)$, if $c(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $\gamma(\mathbb{R}_+)$ have finite Hausdorff distance. By taking limits of minimizing F-geodesic segments from $\gamma(-n)$ to $x = \gamma(0)$ one sees that, for each $x \in H$ and each $\xi = \gamma(-\infty) \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$, there exists an F-ray c with $c(-\infty) = \xi$ and $c(0) = x$. Moreover, by letting x tend to $+\infty$ along γ, one finds a minimal geodesic $c : \mathbb{R} \to H$ with $c(\pm\infty) = \gamma(\pm\infty)$.

For $\xi \in \mathrm{Gro}_\pm(H, g)$ and a g-geodesic γ, we set

$$\mathcal{R}_\pm(\xi) := \{v \in \mathcal{R}_\pm : c_v(\pm\infty) = \xi\},$$
$$\mathcal{M}(\gamma) := \{v \in \mathcal{M} : c_v(-\infty) = \gamma(-\infty) \text{ and } c_v(\infty) = \gamma(\infty)\}.$$

All of these sets in $S_F H$ are non-empty, closed and ϕ_F^t-invariant for $t \in \mathbb{R}_\pm, t \in \mathbb{R}$, respectively. Moreover,

$$\pi(\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)) = H \qquad \forall \xi \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g).$$

The sets $\mathcal{R}_\pm, \mathcal{M}$ of rays and minimal geodesics now decompose:

$$\mathcal{R}_\pm = \bigcup \big\{\mathcal{R}_\pm(\xi) : \xi \in \mathrm{Gro}_\pm(H, g)\big\},$$
$$\mathcal{M} = \bigcup \big\{\mathcal{M}(\gamma) : \gamma \text{ a } g\text{-geodesic}\big\}.$$

Observe also that we have continuity:

$$v_n \to v \text{ in } \mathcal{R}_\pm \quad \Longrightarrow \quad c_{v_n}(\pm\infty) \to c_v(\pm\infty) \text{ in } \mathrm{Gro}_\pm(H, g).$$

Note that $\mathcal{R}_-$ with the decomposition into sets $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ generalizes the construction of the Gromov boundary. One way of expressing the above facts is that the Gromov boundary of F and g (defined in terms of rays) is independent of the metric, so long as the Morse Lemma holds.

3.3. **The width of asymptotic directions.** Let $(M = H/\Gamma, g)$ have curvature bounded from above by a negative constant. The Morse Lemma holds. The following notion has proven to be very useful. It was introduced in [Sch15d].

Definition 3.3. *For $\xi \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ and a g-geodesic $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to H$ we define the* widths of ξ, γ, *respectively:*

$$w_-(\xi) := \sup\big\{\liminf_{t\to-\infty} d_g(c_v(\mathbb{R}_-), c_w(t)) : v, w \in \mathcal{R}_-(\xi)\big\},$$
$$w_0(\gamma) := \sup\big\{\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} d_g(c_v(\mathbb{R}), c_w(t)) : v, w \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma)\big\}.$$

The widths have the following properties (see [Sch15d]).

Proposition 3.4. *(i) The widths w_0, w_- are bounded by the constant $C = C(F, g)$ given by the Morse Lemma.*
(ii) Let $\gamma, \gamma' : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ be two g-rays and let $\{\tau_n\} \subset \Gamma$ with

$$D\tau_n(\dot\gamma(t_n)) \to \dot\gamma'(0) \text{ for some sequence } t_n \to -\infty.$$

Then $w_-(\gamma(-\infty)) \le w_0(\gamma')$.
(iii) If $w_-(\xi) = 0$, then no two rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ intersect.

The last property is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.6.

Let us now assume that M is compact. Using the ergodicity of the g-geodesic flow, for almost every $\xi \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ (using the Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{S}^{\dim M-1} \cong \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$), the g-rays γ with $\gamma(-\infty) = \xi$ are backwards dense in S_gM under the g-geodesic flow. Hence, Proposition 3.4 proves the following.

Corollary 3.5. *Let (M, g) be compact and have negative curvature. If F is a Finsler metric on M, so that there exists a g-geodesic $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to H$ with $w_0(\gamma) = 0$, then $w_-(\xi) = 0$ for almost all $\xi \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$.*

We will see that $\dim M = 2$ implies the existence of γ with $w_0(\gamma) = 0$. In Theorem 7.3 we will even conclude, that for all irrational $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ we have $w_-(\xi) = 0$. In particular, if $\dim M = 2$, then most sets $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ have a simple structure, as there are no intersecting rays. This motivates the following question.

Problem 3.6. *Let (M, g) be compact and have negative curvature, F a Finsler metric on M. Do there always exist g-geodesics $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to H$ with $w_0(\gamma) = 0$?*

4. Dominated functions and weak KAM solutions

In Subsection 2.1 we saw the example of the rotational torus admitting invariant graphs for the geodesic flow. Moreover, in Subsection 2.4 we saw invariant graphs of the form Σ_ξ, Σ_ξ^-. In Subsection 3.2, we already generalized these sets in the form $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$. In this section, we discuss another way of generalizing the notion of such invariant graphs. We follow some ideas from [Fat08].

We translate to the Hamiltonian setting and work in the universal cover H. The dual Finsler metric associated to F is given by

$$F^* : T^*H \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad F^*(\eta) := \max\{\eta(v) : \pi v = \pi\eta,\ F(v) = 1\}.$$

Due to strict convexity of F, the maximum in the definition of $F^*(\eta)$ is attained in a unique point $v \in S_FH \cap T_{\pi\eta}H$, which we denote by $\theta_F(\eta)$. Hence, we obtain the *Fenchel inequality*

$$\eta(v) \le F(v) \cdot F^*(\eta)$$

for all $v \in TH, \eta \in T^*H$ with $\pi v = \pi \eta$ and

$$\eta(v) = F(v) \cdot F^*(\eta) \iff v = F(v) \cdot \theta_F(\eta).$$

The invariant graphs found in the above examples are in this setting graphs of 1-forms

$$\eta : H \to S_F^* H = \{F^* = 1\} \subset T^*H$$

Let us assume that η is C^1 and closed, the latter being automatically the case if $\dim H = 2$. This means that the graph of η is a Lagrangian C^1-submanifold of T^*H. As H is simply connected the closed 1-form η becomes an exact 1-form. Hence, each invariant graph in the above examples lifted to the universal cover H is of the form

$$\{(x, du(x)) : x \in H\} \subset S_F^* H$$

for some C^2-function $u : H \to \mathbb{R}$. Hence, the function u is a solution of the *Hamilton-Jacobi equation* (sometimes called eikonal equation)

$$F^*(du(x)) = 1 \qquad \forall x \in H.$$

We see that being a solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation depends only of the differential of u. In particular, u is a solution if and only if $u + c$ is, for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$.

Definition 4.1. *We identify continuous functions $u, u' \in C^0(H)$, if $u - u' = \text{const.}$. The corresponding equivalence relation is denoted by $\sim$ on $C^0(H)$, denoting equivalence classes by $[u] = \{u + c : c \in \mathbb{R}\}$. We endow $C^0(H)$ with the C^0_{loc}-topology of locally uniform convergence, i.e. we write $u_n \to u$ if*

$$\forall K \subset H \text{ compact}: \quad \max\{u_n(x) - u(x) : x \in K\} \to 0.$$

The quotient $C^0(H)/_\sim$ inherits the quotient C^0_{loc}-topology.

We apply the analogous definitions to functions $u \in C^0(M)$.

In general, we will not be able to find smooth solutions to the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. A common approach (see [Fat08]) is to seek subsolutions in some sense, replacing equality by an inequality in the Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Let $c : [a, b] \to H$ be a C^1-curve and suppose that $F^*(du) \leq 1$ everywhere. Then by the Fenchel inequality

$$\begin{aligned} u(c(b)) - u(c(a)) = \int_a^b du(c)[\dot{c}]\ dt &\leq \int_a^b F(\dot{c}) \cdot F^*(du(c))\ dt \\ &\leq l_F(c; [a, b]). \end{aligned}$$

As c was arbitrary, we find that $F^*(du) \leq 1$ implies

$$u(y) - u(x) \leq d_F(x, y) \qquad \forall x, y \in H. \tag{2}$$

It is not difficult to show that the converse is also true.

Definition 4.2. *A* dominated function *(with respect to F) is an element $[u] \in C^0(H)/_\sim$, whose members satisfy the inequality* (2)*. The set of all dominated functions $[u]$ is denoted by* $\mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$*.*

Observe that the constant functions form an element of $\mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$. Using the triangle inequality it is easy to see that for a given point $x \in H$ the distance function $[d_F(x, .)] \in \mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$. As the Finsler metric F is equivalent to the Riemannian metric g on H, any dominated function is g-Lipschitz with the Lipschitz constant $c_F \geq 1$, in particular continuous and differentiable almost everywhere by Rademacher's theorem. The set $\mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$ is sequentially closed in $C^0(H)/_\sim$ with respect to the C^0_{loc}-topology. Using the theorem of Arzela-Ascoli and the uniform Lipschitz continuous, the set $\mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$ is sequentially compact.

The inequality $u(c(b)) - u(c(a)) \leq l_F(c; [a, b])$ shows the following.

Proposition 4.3. *If $[u] \in \mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$ and if $c : [a, b] \to H$ is an arc-length, continuous, piecewise C^1-curve with $u \circ c(b) - u \circ c(a) = b - a$, then c is a minimizing geodesic segment.*

Definition 4.4. *An arc-length C^1-curve $c : [a, b] \to H$ with $u \circ c(b) - u \circ c(a) = b - a$ is said to* calibrate $[u] \in \mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$ on $[a, b]$*.*

The group of isometries Γ acts on $\mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$ via

$$\tau[u] = [u \circ \tau^{-1}].$$

Hence, if c is $[u]$-calibrated, then $\tau \circ c$ is $\tau[u]$-calibrated.

Note that a calibrating curve $c : [a, b] \to H$ is also calibrating on all $[s, t] \subset [a, b]$. In the next well-known proposition, we relate the calibration property to the differential of u. Recall the map $\theta_F : T^*H \to S_F H$ defined at the beginning of this section.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $[u] \in \mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$, $a < b$ and $c : [a, b] \to H$ be an arc-length geodesic segment.*

(i) If c is $[u]$-calibrated, then u is differentiable with $F^* \circ du = 1$ in $c(a, b) \subset H$ and c satisfies $\dot{c} = \theta_F \circ du \circ c$ in (a, b). Moreover, if u is differentiable in $c(t)$ for $t \in \{a, b\}$, then $\dot{c}(t) = \theta_F \circ du \circ c(t)$.

(ii) If u is differentiable with $F^* \circ du = 1$ in $c(a, b) \subset H$ and if c satisfies $\dot{c} = \theta_F \circ du \circ c$ in (a, b), then c is $[u]$-calibrated.

Remark 4.6. Observe that for the constant functions the are no calibrating curves at all. On the other hand, if u is not differentiable in some point x, then there can be several $[u]$-calibrated curves emanating from x. If u is differentiable in x, then there can be at most one $[u]$-calibrated curve c ending in or emanating from x. Moreover, one

can show Lipschitz regularity results on du, see Sections 4.11 and 4.13 in [Fat08]. This shows that the initial condition $v(x) = \theta_F \circ du(x)$ of a calibrated curve through x has Lipschitz regularity in the domain of du.

Proof. (i). For any $x \in H$ we find by (2)

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_-(x) := -d_F(x, c(b)) + u(c(b)) &\leq u(x) \\ &\leq d_F(c(a), x) + u(c(a)) =: \psi_+(x).\end{aligned}$$

As c calibrates u, we find $\psi_- = u = \psi_+$ in $c(a, b)$, while $\psi_\pm$ are both smooth in $c(a, b)$ by minimality of the segment c. The differentiability of u in $c(a, b)$ follows.

Suppose now that u is differentiable in $c(a)$. By (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}du(c(a))\dot{c}(a) &= \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{1}{t}\big[u(c(a+t) - u(c(a))\big] \\ &\leq \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{1}{t} \int_a^{a+t} F(\dot{c}(s))ds = F(\dot{c}(a)),\end{aligned}$$

which becomes an equality, if c calibrates $[u]$. In the latter case we find

$$\begin{aligned}du(c(a))\dot{c}(a) &= \max\{du(c(a))[v] : \pi v = c(a),\ F(v) = 1\} \\ &= F^*(du(c(a))).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\dot{c}(a) = \theta_F \circ du \circ c(a)$ by definition of θ_F.

(ii) We find by the Fenchel equality along $c(a, b)$, that

$$du(c)[\dot{c}] = du(c)[\theta_F \circ du(c)] = F(\theta_F \circ du(c)) \cdot F^*(du(c)) = 1.$$

The claim follows. □

The elements $[u] \in \mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$ representing invariant graphs in the above example have another property, which we wish to generalize. Let us assume that $F^*(du) \equiv 1$ for some C^2-function $u : H \to \mathbb{R}$. This defines an arc-length C^1-vector field $V(x) := \theta_F \circ du(x)$ on H. Using the solutions of $\dot{c} = V \circ c$ and Proposition 4.5 (ii) proves the following.

Proposition 4.7. *If $u : H \to \mathbb{R}$ is C^2 with $F^*(du) \equiv 1$, then for each point $x \in H$ there exists a C^1-curve $c : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ with $c(0) = x$ calibrating u on $\mathbb{R}_-$.*

Of course, the same holds true for $\mathbb{R}$ instead of $\mathbb{R}_-$.

Definition 4.8. *An element $[u] \in C^0(H)/_\sim$ is a* weak KAM solution *with respect to F, if*

(i) $[u] \in \mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$

(ii) for each $x \in H$ there exists a ray $c : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ with $c(0) = x$ calibrating $[u]$ on $\mathbb{R}_-$.

The set of all weak KAM solutions in (H, F) is denoted by $\mathcal{W}(H, F)$.

4.1. **Directed weak KAM solutions.** As a byproduct we saw that invariant graphs of closed 1-forms in H consist of rays and minimal geodesics. In Section 3 we saw that rays have in some cases a well-defined asymptotic direction. This leads to a special class of weak KAM solutions. In general, a weak KAM solution $u \in \mathcal{W}(H, F)$ admits calibrated rays with many different asymptotic directions.

Definition 4.9. *Assume that (H, g) is a Hadamard manifold and that the Morse Lemma holds. A weak KAM solution $[u] \in \mathcal{W}(H, F)$ is said to be* directed*, if all $[u]$-calibrated rays $c : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ have a common asymptotic direction $\xi = c(-\infty)$. The set of all directed weak KAM solutions will be denoted by $\mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, F)$. The map assigning to $[u] \in \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, F)$ the asymptotic direction $\xi = c(-\infty)$ of its calibrated rays will be denoted by*

$$\delta_F : \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, F) \to \mathrm{Gro}(H, g).$$

One might expect that general weak KAM solutions (and hence candidates of invariant graphs for the geodesic flow in $S_F H$) are "pieced together" by directed ones. In this sense, the directed weak KAM solutions could be treated as simple building blocks. One main objective in this paper is to study the structure of directed weak KAM solutions. We assume for the rest of the section, that (H, g) is a Hadamard manifold and that the Morse Lemma (Theorem 3.1) holds. In the following, we employ some ideas from Section 3 in [Sch15d], referring to [Sch15d] for the proofs (even though we work with horofunctions there, one easily sees that the arguments work for directed weak KAM solutions).

Proposition 4.10. *The set $\mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, F)$ is closed in $C^0(H)/_\sim$ and the map δ_F is continuous and surjective.*

In general, the map δ_F need not be injective. In order to study the injectivity properties, one can show the following.

Proposition 4.11. *The set $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ consists of all rays which are calibrated with respect to some $u \in \delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$. We have $\operatorname{card} \delta_F^{-1}(\xi) = 1$ if and only if there are no intersecting rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$.*

Recall that for (M, g) of negative curvature we defined the width $w_-(\xi)$ in Subsection 3.3. In particular,

$$w_-(\xi) = 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \operatorname{card} \delta_F^{-1}(\xi) = 1.$$

Rays admitting no intersections in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ have special importance due to Proposition 4.11. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 4.12. *An F-ray $c : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ is* (backward) unstable*, if for all rays $c' : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ with $c'(0) \in c(-\infty, 0)$ and $c'(-\infty) = c(-\infty)$ we have $c'(\mathbb{R}_-) \subset c(-\infty, 0)$, i.e. if c does not admit intersecting rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(c(-\infty))$. The set of unstable rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ will be denoted by*

$$\mathcal{A}_-(\xi) \subset \mathcal{R}_-(\xi).$$

Note that results on unstable rays are presented in [Kli71], many of which, however, have an incomplete proof there.

Existence results on unstable rays will be given in Theorems 6.1 (ii), 6.7, 7.1 (iv) and 7.4. In general, however, it is not clear whether $\mathcal{A}_-(\xi) \neq \emptyset$.

It is not difficult to show the following characterization of instability. It resembles a characterization of the Aubry set in Mather theory (see Proposition 5.9), hence the letter $\mathcal{A}$.

Proposition 4.13. *A ray $c : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ is unstable if and only if c is calibrated with respect to all directed weak KAM solutions $[u] \in \delta_F^{-1}(c(-\infty))$.*

The next proposition says that rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ become "almost calibrated" with respect to any $[u] \in \delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$ near $-\infty$. So intuitively, the rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ are unstable near $-\infty$.

Proposition 4.14. *Let $[u] \in \delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$ and $v \in \mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$. Then the function*

$$t \in \mathbb{R}_- \mapsto t - u \circ c_v(t)$$

is bounded and non-decreasing.

The "non-decreasing" part follows from (2). Namely, for $a \leq b$

$$u \circ c_v(b) - u \circ c_v(a) \leq b - a.$$

The "bounded" part is a consequence of the Morse Lemma and the fact that any $u \in \delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$ has some calibrated ray in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ in finite distance of c_v. The proposition shows that for $a \leq b \ll -1$ we have

$$a - u \circ c_v(a) \approx b - u \circ c_v(b),$$

i.e. c_v is "almost u-calibrated".

Finally, we can find "boundary elements" of $\delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$, if $\dim H = 2$. Recall that $\mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$ is sequentially compact.

Proposition 4.15 (boundary of $\delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$)**.** *Let $\dim H = 2$. Then for $\xi \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g) \cong \mathbb{S}^1$, there exist two unique elements $[u_0], [u_1] \in \delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$ with the following property: for any sequence $\xi_n \to \xi$ in $\mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$*

with $\xi_n \neq \xi$ and any sequence $[u_n] \in \delta_F^{-1}(\xi_n)$, any limit point lies in $\{[u_0], [u_1]\}$. More precisely, assuming the counterclockwise orientation of $\mathrm{Gro}(H, g) \cong \mathbb{S}^1$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} [u_n] = \begin{cases} [u_0] & : \text{ if } \xi_n > \xi \ \forall n \\ [u_1] & : \text{ if } \xi_n < \xi \ \forall n \end{cases}.$$

Proposition 4.15 can be used to find "recurrent" directed weak KAM solutions with respect to the group action by Γ. The recurrent elements in $\delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$ always have the recurrent rays as calibrated curves. For this, one uses Proposition 4.14.

Corollary 4.16. *Let $\dim H = 2$. If $\xi \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, F)$ and if $\tau_n \in \Gamma$ is a sequence with $\tau_n \xi \to \xi$, then there exists an element $[u] \in \delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$ with $\tau_n[u] \to [u]$. Moreover, suppose that $v \in \mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ is recurrent under the sequence τ_n, i.e. there exists a sequence $t_n \to -\infty$ with $D\tau_n(c_v(t_n))[\dot{c}_v(t_n)] \to v$ (this means recurrence in the quotient $M = H/\Gamma$). Then c is calibrated with respect to any $[u] \in \delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$ recurrent under $\{\tau_n\}$ in the above sense.*

Hence, recurrent rays have certain instability properties, at least in dimension two. This resembles a fact in Mather theory, where the non-wandering set of the Mañé set is contained in the Aubry set (Proposition 6.33 in [Sor10]).

4.2. **Horofunctions.** So far, we have not discussed directly examples of dominated functions, weak KAM solutions, let alone directed weak KAM solutions. Here we discuss the classical examples, given by Busemann functions and more generally by horofunctions. In particular, we treat the compactification of (H, F) due to Gromov [Gro81], see also [Bal95] or [BH99].

We remarked earlier, that for $x \in H$ we have

$$i_F(x) := [d_F(x, .)] \in \mathrm{Dom}(H, F).$$

The calibrated curves of $i_F(x)$ are precisely the minimizing geodesic segments and forward rays emanating from x. The level sets of $i_F(x)$ are the spheres $\{y \in H : d_F(x, y) = r\}$. The definition of i_F above yields an embedding

$$i_F : H \to C^0(H)/_\sim.$$

The image $i_F(H)$ lies in $\mathrm{Dom}(H, F)$ and hence is sequentially pre-compact with respect to the C^0_{loc}-topology of locally uniform convergence. In particular, the map i_F defines a compactification of H.

Definition 4.17. *The closure* $\overline{i_F(H)} \subset \mathrm{Dom}(H,F)$ *is called the* horofunction compactification *of* (H,F). *The boundary* $\mathrm{Hor}(H,F) := \overline{i_F(H)} - i_F(H)$ *is called the* horofunction boundary *of* (H,F). *The elements of* $\mathrm{Hor}(H,F)$ *are called* horofunctions.

One can show that $i_F(H)$ is open in $\overline{i_F(H)}$ and that $[u] \in \mathrm{Dom}(H,F)$ lies in the boundary $\mathrm{Hor}(H,F)$ if and only if it is the limit of a sequence $i_F(x_n)$ with $d_F(x_0,x_n) \to \infty$ for some and hence any $x_0 \in H$. Hence, all the calibrated curves of $i_F(x_n)$ become in the limit (backward!) rays and minimal geodesics, emanating from an imaginary limit point of the sequence $\{x_n\}$ at infinity and spreading all over H. In particular, $\mathrm{Hor}(H,F) \subset \mathcal{W}(H,F)$. More precisely, one can show the following.

Proposition 4.18. *If* (H,g) *is a Hadamard manifold and if the Morse Lemma holds, then*

$$\mathrm{Hor}(H,F) \subset \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H,F).$$

A standard example is again given by the Poincaré disc (H,g). Given a point ξ in the Gromov boundary $\mathrm{Gro}(H,g) \cong \mathbb{S}^1$, there exists a unique limit $[u_\xi] = \lim i_g(x_n)$ for any sequence $x_n \in H$ converging to ξ in the Euclidean sense in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The level sets of $[u_\xi]$ are the horocycles based at ξ, which are the limits of spheres around the points x_n. The calibrated curves of $[u_\xi]$ form the "unstable manifold" of any geodesic emanating from ξ. The uniqueness of $[u_\xi]$ means that the horofunction compactification $\overline{i_g(H)}$ is in this case homeomorphic to the closed unit disc $H \cup \mathbb{S}^1$ with the Euclidean topology, while $\mathrm{Hor}(H,g) \cong \mathbb{S}^1 \cong \mathrm{Gro}(H,g)$. In the same direction, one shows that in the case of the Poincaré disc

$$\delta_g : \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H,g) \to \mathrm{Gro}(H,g)$$

is a homeomorphism.

Next, we consider Busemann functions, first introduced in [Bus55]. Given a ray $c : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$, one considers the limit

$$b_c := \lim_{t\to\infty} d_F(c(-t),.) - t.$$

Here, $t = d_F(c(-t),c(0))$ by minimality of c. Using the triangle inequality one easily shows that the limit b_c exists and yields an element of $\mathrm{Dom}(H,F)$. In fact,

$$[b_c] = \lim_{t\to\infty} i_F(c(-t)).$$

The minimality of c forces $c(-t)$ to diverge to infinity and b_c to be an element of $\mathrm{Hor}(H,F)$, so that Busemann functions are a special case of horofunctions. Using Busemann functions one infers that any ray is calibrated with respect to some directed weak KAM solution.

4.3. **Injectivity of the asymptotic direction.** Let (H, g) be a Hadamard manifold. We already remarked the following fact in Subsection 3.1. Namely, for fixed $x \in H$, there exists for each $\xi \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ precisely one g-ray $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(-\infty) = \xi$. This shows that there are no intersecting g-rays with common endpoints at $-\infty$. By Proposition 4.11 the map

$$\delta_g : \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, g) \to \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$$

is a homeomorphism. The same holds for $\delta_g|_{\mathrm{Hor}(H,g)}$.

Conversely, if the Morse Lemma holds and if $\delta_F : \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, F) \to \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ is a homeomorphism, then the set of F-rays with a common endpoint at $-\infty$ has a very simple structure, as there are no intersecting rays. Let us pose the following problem.

Problem 4.19. *Let F be a Finsler metric on H, so that the Morse Lemma holds. When is*

$$\delta_F : \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, F) \to \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$$

a homeomorphism? Equivalently, when are all F-rays unstable?

Note that it is enough to show that δ_F is injective. In the case of closed surfaces it is proved in Theorem 12.1 of [HM42], that δ_F is a homeomorphism if F has no conjugate points. Here, also $\mathcal{M} = S_F H$, so that the sets $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ form a continuous foliation of $S_F H$, which could be phrased as C^0-integrability of $\phi_F^t : S_F H \to S_F H$. For the case of $M = \mathbb{T}^2$ and F Riemannian, a metric F on $\mathbb{T}^2$ without conjugate points is flat [Hop48]. We shall later propose a solution to Problem 4.19 in the case of general Finsler metrics on a closed surface M (see Corollaries 8.8 and 8.18).

5. Mather theory

In this section we move to the quotient manifold $M = H/\Gamma$ and we moreover assume that M is compact. The approach in this section is due to Mather [Mat91b] and allows to study minimizers of infinite length in the (compact!) quotient M. Already in Section 4 we considered the case where we were given a C^1 closed 1-form $\eta : M \to S_F^* M$; η defines a graph in $S_F^* M$ invariant under the (dual) geodesic flow. Note that in the quotient we cannot expect η to be exact, as we did when working in the universal cover H. Recall the map $\theta_F : T^*M \to S_F M$ defined in the beginning of Section 4. The following well-known proposition motivates the approach in this section; it rests on the same argument as Proposition 4.5 (ii).

Proposition 5.1. *If $\eta : M \to T^*M$ is a closed 1-form with $F^* \circ \eta \equiv 1$, then for any solution $c : \mathbb{R} \to M$ of $\dot{c} = \theta_F \circ \eta(c)$ and $a \leq b$ we have*

$$\int_a^b F(\dot{c}) - \eta(\dot{c})\ dt = \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 F(\dot{\gamma}) - \eta(\dot{\gamma})\ dt \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all continuous, piecewise C^1-curves $\gamma : [0,1] \to M$ with $\gamma(0) = c(a), \gamma(1) = c(b)$. In particular, the solutions of $\dot{c} = \theta_F \circ \eta(c)$ are F-geodesics.

Note that the integral $\int F(\dot{c}) - \eta(\dot{c})\ dt$ is invariant under orientation preserving reparametrizations of c.

Proof. We have by definition of c, θ_F and $F^* \circ \eta \equiv 1$

$$\int_a^b F(\dot{c}) - \eta(\dot{c})\ dt = \int_a^b F(\dot{c}) - F^*(\eta \circ c)\ dt = \int_a^b 1 - 1\ dt = 0.$$

Let now γ be an arbitrary connection from $c(a)$ to $c(b)$. Then by the Fenchel inequality and $F^* \circ \eta \equiv 1$,

$$\int_a^b F(\dot{\gamma}) - \eta(\dot{\gamma})\ dt \geq \int_a^b F(\dot{\gamma}) - F(\dot{\gamma}) \cdot F^*(\eta \circ \gamma)\ dt = 0.$$

The first claim follows.

To see that the solutions of $\dot{c} = \theta_F \circ \eta(c)$ are F-geodesics, observe that η is locally exact by being closed. This means that the integral $\int F - \eta dt$ along c depends locally only on $\int F dt$ and the endpoints of c, so that the solutions of $\dot{c} = \theta_F \circ \eta(c)$ locally minimize the F-length. □

Proposition 5.1 motivates the study of the "distance"

$$d_{F-\eta}(x,y) = \inf\{l_{F-\eta}(c;[0,1]) \mid c : [0,1] \to M,\ c(0) = x,\ c(1) = y\}$$

on M induced by the "length"

$$l_{F-\eta}(c;[a,b]) := \int_a^b F(\dot{c}) - \eta(\dot{c})\ dt = l_F(c;[a,b]) - \int_c \eta$$

for C^1-curves $c : [a,b] \to M$. Here, η is a smooth, closed 1-form on M. Note that if $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function, then $l_{F-\eta}$ and $l_{F-\eta+df}$ have the same minimizers. Hence, we shall fix a given cohomology class in $H^1(M,\mathbb{R})$ and take any closed 1-form η representing this class. The closed 1-form η will be treated as given.

As an example, let F be a Finsler metric on the 2-torus $\mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$. Closed 1-forms are of the form

$$\eta = \langle\, v, .\, \rangle + df,$$

where $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is a constant vector and $f : \mathbb{T}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function. Then we have

$$l_{F-\eta}(c;[a,b]) = l_F(c;[a,b]) - \int_a^b \langle\, v, \dot{c}\,\rangle\, dt - f \circ c(b) + f \circ c(a).$$

Fixing the endpoints $c(a), c(b)$, the "length" $l_{F-\eta}$ singles out geodesics $c : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{T}^2$ whose lifts $\tilde{c} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ to the universal cover seem shorter if they travel in the direction v, and longer if they travel against the direction v. That is, if c minimizers the "length" $l_{F-\eta}$, it will travel in the direction of v. If $F = |.|$ is the Euclidean metric, then the minimizers will be straight lines of direction v. Note that in standard coordinates v is given by the cohomology class $[\eta] \in H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) \cong \mathbb{R}^2$.

We return to the general case. One can see that the definition of $d_{F-\eta}$ is problematic. Indeed, if η is "too large", then the distance defined using $l_{F-\eta}$ will be $-\infty$. Hence, we need to define a set of appropriate η's. Consider the set $\mathfrak{M}(F)$ of probability measures supported in the unit tangent bundle $S_F M$ invariant under the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t, endowed with the topology of weak convergence. We define the *rotation vector*

$$\rho : \mathfrak{M}(F) \to H_1(M,\mathbb{R}) = H^1(M,\mathbb{R})^*, \qquad \rho(\mu)([\eta]) := \int_{TM} \eta \; d\mu.$$

Note that $\rho(\mu)$ is well-defined due to flow-invariance of μ. Indeed, if $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is any smooth function then

$$\begin{aligned}\int df \; d\mu &= \int \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} f(c_v(t)) \; d\mu(v) = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} \int f \circ \pi \circ \phi_F^t \; d\mu \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} \int f \circ \pi \; d\mu = 0.\end{aligned}$$

The map ρ is affine and continuous and the set $\mathfrak{M}(F)$ is convex and compact, such that the set

$$B(F) := \rho(\mathfrak{M}(F)) \subset H_1(M,\mathbb{R})$$

is convex and compact. The convex polar of $B(F)$ is the convex, compact set given by

$$B^*(F) := \big\{[\eta] \in H^1(M,\mathbb{R}) : \langle [\eta], h\,\rangle \leq 1 \;\forall h \in B(F)\big\}.$$

One can show that the relative interior of $B(F)$ and hence of $B^*(F)$ is open in $H_1(M,\mathbb{R}), H^1(M,\mathbb{R})$, respectively.

The observations in the next lemma are crucial in Mather theory. They motivate using the elements in $\partial B^*(F)$ for the "distance" $d_{F-\eta}$ to obtain interesting minimizers, where the boundary

$$\partial B^*(F) := \big\{[\eta] \in B^*(F) \mid \exists h \in B(F) : \; \langle [\eta], h\,\rangle = 1\big\}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let η be a closed 1-form on M*

(i) If $[\eta]$ lies in the complement of $B^*(F)$, then $d_{F-\eta} \equiv -\infty$. In particular, there are no $l_{F-\eta}$-minimizers.

(ii) If $[\eta]$ lies in $B^*(F)$, then $d_{F-\eta}$ is bounded.

(iii) If $[\eta]$ lies in the interior $B^*(F) - \partial B^*(F)$, then for any two points $x, y \in M$ there exists an F-geodesic minimizing the length functional $l_{F-\eta}$ on curves from x to y and there exist no $l_{F-\eta}$-minimizers of infinite length.

(iv) If $[\eta]$ lies in the boundary $\partial B^*(F)$, then any vector v in the support of some $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(F)$ with $\rho(\mu)([\eta]) = 1$ defines an F-geodesic $c_v : \mathbb{R} \to M$ minimizing $l_{F-\eta}$ between any of its points. In particular, there exist $l_{F-\eta}$-minimizers of infinite length.

Proof. (i). Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(F)$ with $\rho(\mu)([\eta]) > 1$. By Birkhoff's ergodic theorem we find $v \in \operatorname{supp} \mu$ with

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \eta(\phi_F^t v)\ dt \geq \int \eta\ d\mu > 1.$$

Hence, for $T \gg 1$ we find

$$l_{F-\eta}(c_v; [0,T]) = T - \int_0^T \eta(\phi_F^t v)\ dt \leq -\varepsilon T$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $l_{F-\eta}$ becomes unbounded from below.

(ii). An upper bound can be found using that M is compact and η is fixed. Assume that $d_{F-\eta}$ is not bounded from below. One can use the upper bound to find a closed C^1-curve in M with negative $F-\eta$-length. Replacing this curve by a shortest closed geodesic in the same free homotopy class, the F-length decreases, while the η-integral stays unchanged by η being closed. This shows that there is a closed F-geodesic $c : [0,T] \to M$ with negative $F-\eta$-length. Consider the measure $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(F)$ evenly distributed on the orbit $\dot{c}[0,T]$. Then

$$\rho(\mu)([\eta]) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \eta(\dot{c})\ dt = \frac{1}{T}\left(T - l_{F-\eta}(c; [0,T])\right) > 1,$$

a contradiction.

(iii). Given any pair $x, y \in M$ and an arc-length C^1-curve $c : [0,T] \to M$ from x to y, choose a lift $\tilde{c}$ of c to the universal cover H and choose a primitive $u : H \to \mathbb{R}$ of the lift $\tilde{\eta}$ of η to H. Replace $\tilde{c}$ by a minimizing geodesic segment $\tilde{c}_0$ with the same endpoints. The $F-\eta$-length of the projection c_0 of $\tilde{c}_0$ does not increase, as the integral $\int_c \eta = \int_{\tilde{c}} du$ depends in the universal cover only on the value $u(\tilde{c}(T)) - u(\tilde{c}(0))$. Hence, we can restrict to F-geodesic segments from x to y, when we look for $l_{F-\eta}$-minimizers. Let now $v \in S_F M$. Then for any limit measure μ of

probabilities μ_{T_n} evenly distributed along the orbit segment $\dot{c}_v[0,T_n]$ as $T_n \to \infty$ we find

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{T_n} \int_0^{T_n} \eta(\phi_F^t v)\ dt = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int \eta\ d\mu_{T_n} = \int \eta\ d\mu = \rho(\mu)([\eta]) < 1.$$

Hence, for $T \gg 1$ we find

$$l_{F-\eta}(c_v;[0,T]) = T - \int_0^T \eta(\phi_F^t v)\ dt \geq \varepsilon T$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$. This shows that when looking for $l_{F-\eta}$-minimizers, we have to consider only F-geodesics of bounded length, which form a compact family. The claim follows.

(iv). Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(F)$ with $\rho(\mu)([\eta]) = 1$, let $v \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$ and let $x \in M$ be arbitrary. The triangle inequality shows for any $a \leq b$, that

$$d_{F-\eta}(x, c_v(b)) \leq d_{F-\eta}(x, c_v(a)) + l_{F-\eta}(c_v;[a,b]). \tag{3}$$

Rewriting this inequality and integrating with respect to μ, we find by the ϕ_F^t-invariance of μ and $\rho(\mu)([\eta]) = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int d_{F-\eta}(x,.) \circ \pi \circ \phi_F^b\ d\mu - \int d_{F-\eta}(x,.) \circ \pi \circ \phi_F^a\ d\mu \\ &\leq \int_a^b \int (F-\eta) \circ \phi_F^t\ d\mu\ dt = (b-a) \cdot \int (F-\eta)\ d\mu = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the integrated triangle inequality is an equality and for all points $v \in \operatorname{supp}\mu$. We obtain from (3) and again the triangle inequality, that

$$l_{F-\eta}(c_v;[a,b]) = d_{F-\eta}(x, c_v(b)) - d_{F-\eta}(x, c_v(a)) \leq d_{F-\eta}(c_v(a), c_v(b)).$$

The claim follows. □

By taking $x = c_v(b)$ in the proof of Lemma 5.2 (iv), one finds the even stronger minimization property

$$l_{F-\eta}(c_v;[a,b]) = -d_{F-\eta}(c_v(b), c_v(a))$$

for the points v in the support of μ.

Lemma 5.2 suggests the following definitions.

Definition 5.3. *Let $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F) \subset H^1(M,\mathbb{R})$.*

(i) An F-geodesic segment $c : [a,b] \to M$ with

$$l_{F-\eta}(c;[a,b]) = d_{F-\eta}(c(a), c(b))$$

is called $[\eta]$-semistatic on $[a,b]$. *The set of initial conditions of geodesics which are $[\eta]$-semistatic on $\mathbb{R}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_{[\eta]} \subset S_F M$ and called the* $[\eta]$-Mañé set.

(ii) An F-geodesic segment $c : [a, b] \to M$ with

$$l_{F-\eta}(c; [a, b]) = -d_{F-\eta}(c(b), c(a))$$

is called $[\eta]$-static on $[a, b]$. *The set of initial conditions of geodesics which are $[\eta]$-static on $\mathbb{R}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_{[\eta]} \subset S_F M$ and called the* $[\eta]$-Aubry set.

(iii) A measure $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(F)$ is called $[\eta]$-minimizing, *if $\rho(\mu)([\eta]) = 1$. The union of the supports of $[\eta]$-minimizing measures is denoted by $\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]} \subset S_F M$ and called the* $[\eta]$-Mather set.

Remark 5.4. As η is exact in the universal cover H, one can easily show that

$$\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]} \subset \mathcal{A}_{[\eta]} \subset \mathcal{N}_{[\eta]} \subset Dp(\mathcal{M}) \subset S_F M.$$

Note that $\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]}$ is always non-empty.

Remark 5.5. In Subsection 2.3 we remarked that the notion of minimal geodesics can also be defined in the quotient M, via homotopic minimization. One could define a curve $c : \mathbb{R} \to M$ to be homologically minimizing, if for all $a < b$ and all curves $c' : [0, 1] \to M$ with $c'(0) = c(a), c'(1) = c(b)$, which are homologous to $c|_{[a,b]}$, $c|_{[a,b]}$ has minimal F-length. The union of all homologically minimizing geodesics should correspond to the union of all curves c, which are $[\eta]$-semistatic with respect to some $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F)$. One could also define homological minimization in the abelian cover. See Proposition 2, p. 182 in [Mat91b].

We saw in Lemma 5.2, that any orbit in the support of a minimizing measure is semistatic, which can be written as $\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]} \subset \mathcal{N}_{[\eta]}$. The converse is also true. In this sense, the minimizing measures are precisely those measures supported on minimizing orbits.

Proposition 5.6. *If μ is a ϕ_F^t-invariant probability measure supported in $\mathcal{N}_{[\eta]}$ for $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F)$, then $\rho(\mu)([\eta]) = 1$, i.e. μ is an $[\eta]$-minimizing measure.*

Proof. Let us assume that μ is ergodic, the general case following from the fact that ρ is affine and arbitrary invariant probabilities are convex

combinations of ergodic ones. Choose a μ-typical $v \in \mathcal{N}_{[\eta]}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(\mu)([\eta]) &= \int \eta d\mu = \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \eta \circ \phi_F^t v dt \\ &= \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \left(T - l_{F-\eta}(c_v; [0,T])\right) \\ &= 1 - \lim_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} d_{F-\eta}(c_v(0), c_v(T)) \\ &= 1.\end{aligned}$$

Here we used that $d_{F-\eta}$ is bounded. □

Remark 5.7. There is a relationship between the above notions and the geodesic stretch, see e.g. [Kni95]. Given $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(F)$, we can define its *geodesic stretch* by

$$S(\mu) := \int_{S_F M} \lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{d_g(\widetilde{c_v}(0), \widetilde{c_v}(t))}{t} d\mu(v),$$

where $\widetilde{c_v} : \mathbb{R} \to H$ denotes an arbitrary lift of the F-geodesic $c_v : \mathbb{R} \to M$. The larger the stretch of an element $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(F)$, the shorter do the geodesics in the support of μ become. Hence, one should be able to relate the property "maximizing the stretch" to "supported in $Dp(\mathcal{M})$". Hence, we replace maximizing $\rho(.)([\eta])$ by maximizing S. The advantage of using the stretch is one finds a larger class of "minimizing measures". We shall study "periodic measures" in Subsection 6.4. Note in this connection also [Boy00] associating to measures $\mu \in \mathfrak{M}(F)$ with positive stretch a rotation measure $\hat{\rho}(\mu) \in \mathfrak{M}(g)$, provided that the Morse Lemma holds. The dynamics in $\operatorname{supp} \mu$ "shadow" the dynamics in $\operatorname{supp} \hat{\rho}(\mu)$ via Theorem 3.1.

5.1. **Weak KAM solutions in Mather theory.** In Section 4 we used the distance d_F in H to define dominated functions and weak KAM solutions $u : H \to \mathbb{R}$ (Definitions 4.2 and 4.8). We take the analogous definitions using the distance $d_{F-\eta}$ for elements $[u] \in C^0(M)/_\sim$, which yields *η-dominated functions* and *η-weak KAM solutions*. Note that this definition depends on the representative $\eta \in [\eta]$. The calibration condition becomes

$$l_{F-\eta}(c; [a,b]) = d_{F-\eta}(c(a), c(b)).$$

An instance of an η-weak KAM solution is the "Busemann function" associated to a $[\eta]$-semistatic ray $c : \mathbb{R}_- \to M$, given by

$$[b_c] := \lim_{t\to\infty} [d_{F-\eta}(c(-t), .)].$$

Using such "Busemann functions", one can see that every $[\eta]$-semistatic ray c is calibrated with respect to some η-weak KAM solution $[b_c]$.

We already remarked that $[\eta]$-semistatic curves lift to minimal geodesics in the universal cover H. Similarly, one can lift η-weak KAM solutions to weak KAM solutions in $\mathcal{W}(H,F)$. Note that a closed 1-form η on M has a lift $\tilde{\eta}$ in H and $\tilde{\eta}$ has a primitive $h : H \to \mathbb{R}$ with $dh = \tilde{\eta}$.

Proposition 5.8. *If η is a closed 1-form on M with $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F)$, $h : H \to \mathbb{R}$ a primitive of the lift $\tilde{\eta}$ to H and if $[u] \in C^0(M)/_\sim$ is η-dominated, then*

$$[\tilde{u}] := [h + u \circ p] \in \mathrm{Dom}(H,F)$$

and the $[\tilde{u}]$-calibrated curves are the lifts of the $[u]$-calibrated curves. In particular, if $[u]$ is an η-weak KAM solution, then

$$[\tilde{u}] \in \mathcal{W}(H,F).$$

Proof. Observe that for $x, y \in H$ and the covering map $p : H \to M$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{F-\eta}(px,py) &= \inf_{\tau\in\Gamma} d_{F-\tilde{\eta}}(x,\tau y) = \inf_{\tau\in\Gamma} d_F(x,\tau y) - h(\tau y) + h(x) \\ &\leq d_F(x,y) - h(y) + h(x). \end{aligned}$$

The first claim follows. For the latter claim, observe that if $c : [a,b] \to M$ is $[u]$-calibrated and if $\tilde{c} : [a,b] \to H$ is a lift, then

$$\begin{aligned} l_F(\tilde{c};[a,b]) = l_F(c;[a,b]) &= u \circ c(b) - u \circ c(a) + \int_a^b \eta(\dot{c})dt \\ &= u \circ p \circ \tilde{c}(b) - u \circ p \circ \tilde{c}(a) + \int_a^b dh(\dot{\tilde{c}})dt \\ &= u \circ p \circ \tilde{c}(b) - u \circ p \circ \tilde{c}(a) + h \circ \tilde{c}(b) - h \circ \tilde{c}(a). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the second claim. □

Using the analogous version of Proposition 4.5 for $d_{F-\eta}$ in M, one sees that every $[\eta]$-semistatic ray is simple in M, i.e. has no self-intersections. This is by far not true for all minimal geodesics. In particular, the family of semistatic geodesics is in general much smaller than the set of minimal geodesics. Furthermore, not every weak KAM solution $[u] \in \mathcal{W}(H,F)$ is the lift of some weak KAM solution $[u]$ from M using some closed 1-form and in general $[\tilde{u}]$ is not directed, if the Morse Lemma holds. We will show, however, that $[\tilde{u}]$ is always directed, if M is the 2-torus, see Subsection 8.1.

We defined the Aubry set and the Mañé set using (semi)static curves. There is another characterization using weak KAM solutions. Compare this to Proposition 4.13.

Proposition 5.9. *An F-geodesic is $[\eta]$-static (semistatic), if and only if it is calibrated with respect to all (one) η-weak KAM solution.*

5.2. **Mather's avarage action.** Let us recall another way to define the sets $B(F)$ and $B^*(F)$ due to Mather [Mat91b]. Namely, given the Finsler metric F, one can define the "Tonelli" Lagrangian

$$L_F := \frac{1}{2}F^2.$$

Write $\mathfrak{M}(L_F)$ for the probability measures in TM, which are invariant under the Euler-Lagrange flow of L_F (which equals the geodesic flow of F) and satisfy $\int L_F d\mu < \infty$. We can define the rotation vector $\rho : \mathfrak{M}(L_F) \to H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$ as above. *Mather's α- and β-functions* are given by

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_F : H^1(M, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}, \\ &\alpha_F([\eta]) := -\inf \left\{ \int L_F - \eta \; d\mu : \mu \in \mathfrak{M}(L_F) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\beta_F : H_1(M, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}, \\ &\beta_F(h) := \inf \left\{ \int L_F \; d\mu : \mu \in \mathfrak{M}(L_F), \rho(\mu) = h \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The functions α_F, β_F are convex and superlinear. α_F is the Fenchel transform of β_F and vice versa. Moreover, using the homogeneity of L_F one finds $\alpha(s \cdot [\eta]) = s^2\alpha([\eta])$ and $\beta(sh) = s^2\beta(h)$ for $s \geq 0$. One shows that

$$B(F) = \{\beta_F \leq 1/2\}, \qquad B^*(F) = \{\alpha_F \leq 1/2\}.$$

The Mather set $\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]}$ is given by the union of supports of measures realizing the infimum in the definition of $\alpha_F([\eta])$. Similarly, one defines a Mather set $\mathcal{M}^h$ as the union of supports of measures realizing the infimum in the definition of $\beta_F(h)$. If $\alpha_F([\eta]) = 1/2 = \beta_F(h)$, then $\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]}, \mathcal{M}^h \subset S_F M$.

Let us write

$$\sigma_F(h) := \sqrt{2\beta_F(h)}.$$

A classical way to obtain σ_F directly is given by

$$\sigma_F(h) = \inf \left\{ \sum |r_i| \cdot l_F(c_i) \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all $r_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and real Lipschitz 1-cycles c_i in M with $\sum r_i[c_i] = h$ [Mas96]. The function

$$\sigma_F : H_1(M, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$$

is called the *stable norm of* F (it defines a non-reversible, convex norm on $H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$). Hence, the set $B(F)$ is given by the 1-ball of the stable norm. If F is Riemannian, then one can use the Riemannian q-dimensional volume to define σ_F on the higher homology groups $H_q(M, \mathbb{R})$.

Mather's α-function can be recovered using η-dominated functions, recalling the dual Finsler metric F^* defined in Section 4.

Proposition 5.10 ([CIPP98])**.**

$$\alpha_F([\eta]) = \inf_{\eta' \in [\eta]} \max_{x \in M} \frac{1}{2}(F^* \circ \eta'(x))^2.$$

Here, we can assume that the cohomology class $[\eta]$ consists of smooth 1-forms cohomologous to the smooth 1-form η.

6. Rational directions

In this section we study rays and minimal geodesics in finite distance of periodic g-geodesics. Hence, these rays are expected to admit some form of periodicity.

6.1. **Structure of rational rays in 2 dimensions.** We start with the 2-dimensional case, where the classical results are due to Morse [Mor24] and Hedlund [Hed32]. Let M be a closed, orientable surface of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 1$. The Morse Lemma holds for the constant curvature metrics g described in Subsection 2.4. Let us fix a non-trivial, prime element $\tau \in \Gamma$. By M being closed, τ represents a free homotopy class containing shortest closed F-geodesics. We fix a τ-periodic g-geodesic $\gamma_\tau \subset H$ and set

$$\xi_\tau := \gamma_\tau(-\infty).$$

In particular, $\xi_\tau \in \Pi_M \subset \mathbb{S}^1 \cong \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ and in the case of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$ (i.e. (H, g) is the Poincaré disc), ξ_τ is the stable fixed point of the hyperbolic transformation τ; if $\mathfrak{g} = 1$, then ξ_τ has rational or infinite slope.

We consider the set of minimal geodesics $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau) \subset S_F H$ in finite distance of γ_τ and the set of rays $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi_\tau)$. We already saw in Remark 3.2, that the shortest closed geodesics in the homotopy class τ lift to minimal geodesics in the universal cover H. Hence, the set of τ-periodic minimal geodesics

$$\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau) := \{v \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau) : \tau \circ c_v(\mathbb{R}) = c_v(\mathbb{R})\}$$

is non-empty and consists of lifts of shortest closed geodesics in homotopy classes $\tau^k, k \geq 1$. Moreover, the set $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau)$ is closed and τ-invariant and defines a lamination of H by minimal geodesics "parallel" to γ_τ. In particular, we can speak of pairs c_0, c_1 of neighboring τ-periodic minimal geodesics (i.e. in the strip between c_0, c_1 there are no further τ-periodic minimal geodesics). If $M = \mathbb{T}^2$, the set $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau)$ is invariant under the whole group $\Gamma \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$. The following theorem summarizes further structure properties of $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau)$ and $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi_\tau)$.

Theorem 6.1 (Morse, Hedlund)**.** *(i) If $v \in \mathcal{R}_-(\xi_\tau)$, then $c_v(-t)$ is asymptotic to some τ-periodic minimal geodesic $c_0(\mathbb{R})$, as $t \to \infty$. The analogous statement holds for $v \in \mathcal{R}_+(\gamma_\tau(\infty))$.*

(ii) If $v \in \mathcal{R}_-(\xi_\tau)$ and $\pi v = \pi w$ for some $w \in \mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau)$, then $v = w$.

(iii) For any $v \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau) - \mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau)$, the geodesic c_v is heteroclinic between a pair c_0, c_1 of neighboring τ-periodic minimal geodesics. Conversely, for any pair of neighboring minimal geodesics c_0, c_1 there exist heteroclinic minimal geodesics of both possible asymptotic behaviors.

(iv) If $S \subset H$ is a connected component of $H - \pi(\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau))$ and if c_0 is a minimal geodesic from $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau)$ forming a component of the boundary ∂S, then for any $x \in S$ there exists a ray $c : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ with $c(0) = x$, which is asymptotic to $c_0(\mathbb{R})$.

Note that in the case $M = \mathbb{T}^2$, the set $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi_\tau)$ is Γ-invariant. In this case, each component S of $H - \pi(\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau))$ is a strip bounded by a pair c_0, c_1 of neighboring τ-periodic minimal geodesics c_0, c_1. Assume that c_1 lies left (or above) c_0 in the usual orientation of $H = \mathbb{R}^2$. For $i = 0, 1$ let $\mathcal{R}^i_-(\xi_\tau)$ be the set of rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi_\tau) - \mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau)$ being asymptotic to c_i, in each of the strips S. Then

$$\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau) \cup \mathcal{R}^i_-(\xi_\tau), \qquad i = 0, 1$$

form two Γ-invariant sets, admitting no intersecting rays in $\mathbb{T}^2$. We can relate these sets to directed weak KAM solutions.

Proposition 6.2. *If $M = \mathbb{T}^2$, then $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau) \cup \mathcal{R}^i_-(\xi_\tau)$ consist precisely of the calibrated rays of the directed weak KAM solutions $[u_i] \in \delta_F^{-1}(\xi_\tau)$ given by Proposition 4.15.*

We refer to [Mor24] and [Hed32] for the proof of Theorem 6.1. See also [Sch15a]. We shall only sketch here, how item (i) of Theorem 6.1 implies item (ii), as the argument will appear again later in Subsections 6.4 and 7.2.

Sketch of the proof of Theorem 6.1 (ii). Let v, w be as described in the statement of the theorem and write $c_w = c_0$. By item (i) of Theorem



FIGURE 3. Some geodesics from $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau)$ for $\tau \in \Gamma$. There are some strips foliated by τ-periodic geodesics and in between them there are gaps overstretched by heteroclinics. On the right one can see a geometric situation generating closed and heteroclinic minimals.

6.1, both backward rays $c_v(t), \tau^{-1}c_v(t)$ are asymptotic as $t \to -\infty$ to a single τ-periodic minimal geodesic c_1. Let $T < 0$ such that $\widehat{\tau\dot{c}_i}(0) = \dot{c}_i(T)$ for $i = 0, 1$ – note that we have the same period $|T|$ for both c_0 and c_1 due to minimality of c_i. Due to the periodicity of c_1 we find $S \ll -1$, such that $d_F(\tau^{-1}c_v(S+T), c_v(S)) \approx 0$. Assuming $v \neq w$, we find some $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, such that

$$d_F(c_v(-\delta), c_0(\delta)) \leq 2\delta - \varepsilon$$

by shortening the vertex at $c_0(0) = c_v(0)$. Hence, using the triangle inequality and minimality of $\tau^{-1}c_v$, we obtain a contradiction:

$$\begin{aligned} -T - S &= d_F(\tau^{-1}c_v(S+T), \tau^{-1}c_v(0)) \approx d_F(c_v(S), c_0(-T)) \\ &\leq d_F(c_v(S), c_v(-\delta)) + d_F(c_v(-\delta), c_0(\delta)) + d_F(c_0(\delta), c_0(-T)) \\ &\leq -S - \delta + 2\delta - \varepsilon - T - \delta \\ &= -T - S - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

Observe that the structure results in Theorem 6.1 resemble the dynamics in the saddle connection seen in the phase portrait of the simple pendulum, which was discussed in Subsection 2.1. See also Figure 3.

6.2. **Oscillating local minimizers in 2 dimensions.** In the previous subsection we saw that in the two-dimensional case, there can occur minimal geodesics c_0, c_1 invariant under a deck transformation τ, bounding a strip with no further τ-periodic minimizers; we called c_0, c_1 neighboring. We shall assume that c_1 lies left of c_0 (or above c_0). In between c_0, c_1, there exist heteroclinic minimizers of two classes,

namely

$$\mathcal{M}^+(c_0,c_1) := \{v \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau) : d_g(c_0(\mathbb{R}), c_v(-t)), d_g(c_1(\mathbb{R}), c_v(t)) \overset{t\to\infty}{\to} 0\},$$
$$\mathcal{M}^-(c_0,c_1) := \{v \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau) : d_g(c_1(\mathbb{R}), c_v(-t)), d_g(c_0(\mathbb{R}), c_v(t)) \overset{t\to\infty}{\to} 0\}.$$

Both classes consist of asymptotic minimizers and hence, by Lemma 2.6, there are no intersecting geodesics in each of the classes. Assume for the moment that one of the classes, say $\mathcal{M}^+(c_0,c_1)$ projects onto the open strip between c_0, c_1 denoted by $S(c_0,c_1) \subset H$. Then $\mathcal{M}^+(c_0,c_1)$ forms a continuous graph over the strip $S(c_0,c_1)$ and defines a C^1 weak KAM solution $[u]$ in $S(c_0,c_1)$ in the sense of Definition 4.8. This would be a desirable situation. Observe that, if c_0, c_1 are hyperbolic closed orbits for the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t in S_FM, then $\mathcal{M}^\pm(c_0,c_1)$ are parts of the (un)stable manifolds of c_0, c_1. It is known that these intersect transversely for generic choices of F, prohibiting the classes $\mathcal{M}^\pm(c_0,c_1)$ to form continuous invariant graphs. Hence, the following condition, called the *gap condition* is fulfilled for many choices of F:

$$\pi(\mathcal{M}^+(c_0,c_1)) \neq S(c_0,c_1) \qquad \& \qquad \pi(\mathcal{M}^-(c_0,c_1)) \neq S(c_0,c_1). \tag{4}$$

The following theorem is proved in [Sch15b]; an earlier version is due to Bolotin and Rabinowitz [BR02]. It shows that the gap condition implies the existence of oscillating dynamics in the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t, which is contrary to integrable behavior. See Figure 4.

Theorem 6.3. *Let M be a closed, orientable surface of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 1$ and F any Finsler metric on $M = H/\Gamma$. Suppose there exists $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$ and in the universal cover H a pair of neighboring τ-periodic minimal geodesics $c_0, c_1 : \mathbb{R} \to H$ satisfying the gap condition (4). Then there exists an open disc $D \subset S(c_0,c_1)$, an integer $N \geq 1$ and for each given finite sequence $\kappa = \{k_1 < ... < k_n\}$ of integers and each pair $i = (i_-, i_+) \in \{0,1\}^2$ a locally minimizing geodesic $c_{\kappa,i} : \mathbb{R} \to S(c_0,c_1)$ with the following properties:*

- *$c_{\kappa,i}(\pm t)$ enters the ends of $S(c_0,c_1)$ and is asymptotic to $c_{i_\pm}(\mathbb{R})$ as $t \to \infty$,*
- *$c_{\kappa,i}$ is disjoint from the translated discs $\tau^{k_i N} D$ for $i = 1, ..., n$ and passes two successive discs on opposite sides.*

We will see (Subsection 9.1) that the construction of minimal geodesics with the behavior of the $c_{\kappa,i}$ in Theorem 6.3 is impossible. Locally minimizing means that the geodesic $c_{\kappa,i}(\mathbb{R})$ has an open neighborhood $U \subset S(c_0,c_1)$, such that $c_{\kappa,i}$ is minimizing between any of its points under all curves lying entirely in U. In particular, $c_{\kappa,i}$ has no conjugate points.



FIGURE 4. The geodesic $c_{\kappa,i}$ in Theorem 6.3. The black dots are the successive translates of the disc D.

Applied to $M = \mathbb{T}^2$, Theorem 6.3 shows the following. Either the set $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau))$ contains a ϕ_F^t-invariant C^0-graph, producing a C^1 weak KAM solution $[u]$ in $(\mathbb{T}^2, F)$, or the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t is chaotic in the sense that it depends sensitively on initial conditions. Indeed, for fixed $i = (i_-, i_+)$ the initial conditions $Dp(\dot{c}_{\kappa,i}(-t))$ with $t \gg -1$ all lie close to each other in $S_F\mathbb{T}^2$, but for varying κ have distinguishable long-time behavior unter ϕ_F^t.

6.3. **2-dimensional cylinders.** So far, we have in this section assumed that the surface M is compact. Here we treat the non-compact case where

$$M = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$$

is the 2-dimensional cylinder. Recall that, by assumption, the metrics F and g on M are equivalent via some constant $c_F \geq 1$, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{c_F}|.|_g \leq F \leq c_F|.|_g.$$

If both ends of the cylinder become wide enough with respect to g one can infer that there exist shortest closed geodesics in the prime homotopy class of M, lifting to minimal geodesics in the universal cover $H = \mathbb{R}^2$ (see Remark 3.2). Such minimal geodesics wind asymptotically around the cylinder in the $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$-direction. Using the Morse Lemma, one can moreover study many minimal geodesics in the universal cover, if g has strictly negative curvature. If the ends of the cylinder become thin, one could suspect that almost all geodesics are recurrent.

In this subsection, we shall assume that g is the standard Euclidean metric. Of course, one can find minimal geodesics in M going from one end of M to the other (i.e. along the $\mathbb{R}$-direction), but it is not clear whether there are any minimal geodesics winding around the $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$-direction.

We can prove the following theorem, writing $e_1 = (1, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Theorem 6.4. *If the constant c_F in the equivalence of F and g is sufficiently close to 1, then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ depending only on c_F and*

a minimal geodesic $c : \mathbb{R} \to M$, such that

$$\liminf_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{-T}^{0} \langle\, \dot{c}(t), e_1 \,\rangle\, dt \geq \varepsilon, \qquad \liminf_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} \langle\, \dot{c}(t), e_1 \,\rangle\, dt \geq \varepsilon.$$

In Section 11.1 we observe the connection between monotone twist maps of the cylinder $C = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$ and geodesic flows of Finsler metrics on the torus $\mathbb{T}^2$. For geodesic flows on the cylinder M there is the analogous connection to monotone twist maps of the plane $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. Loss in the periodicity in the second component of M corresponds to losing periodicity in the first component of C. In this setting, Kunze and Ortega have established the existence of certain orbits, for certain types of monotone twist maps of the plane, see [KO11] and the references therein. We will prove Theorem 6.4 by arguments similar to the ones leading to Theorem 14 in [KO11]. A particular open question building on Theorem 6.4 and [KO11] would be what assumptions on F, g lead to recurrent geodesics in (M, F).

Proof of Theorem 6.4. In the following, we denote by

$$e_F(c[a, b]) = \int_a^b F(\dot{c}(t))^2 dt$$

the F-energy of C^1 curves $c : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}^2 = H$.

Choose some $X = (X_1, X_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $X_i > 0$ and let $c = (c_1, c_2) : [0, L] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be an l_F-minimal segment with $c(0) = -X, c(L) = X$, such that $F(\dot{c}) \equiv 1$. It follows that each subsegment of c is minimal with respect to e_F under all curve segments with the same end points and the same connection time.

Let $t_0, t_1 \in [0, L]$, such that the intervals $[t_0, t_0 + 2], [t_1, t_1 + 1]$ lie in $[0, L]$ and are disjoint. Consider the straight Euclidean segments with constant $|.|$-speed, writing $e_1 = (1, 0)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma_0 : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \sigma_0(0) = c(t_0), \qquad \sigma_0(1) = c(t_0 + 2) - e_1, \\ &\sigma_1 : [0, 2] \to \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \sigma_1(0) = c(t_1) - e_1, \quad \sigma_1(2) = c(t_1 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

We assume e.g. $t_0 + 2 \leq t_1$, the other case being analogous. The new curve

$$\hat{c} : [t_0, t_1 + 1] \to \mathbb{R}^2, \qquad \hat{c} = \sigma_0 * (c|_{[t_0+2, t_1]} - e_1) * \sigma_1$$

connects $c(t_0)$ to $c(t_1 + 1)$ in time $t_1 + 1 - t_0$. By c being minimizing, $F(\dot{c}) = 1$, the uniform equivalence of F and $|.|$ and invariance of F

under $x \mapsto x + e_1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 + e_F(c[t_0+2, t_1]) + 1 \\ &= e_F(c[t_0, t_1+1]) \\ &\leq e_F(\hat{c}[t_0, t_1+1]) \\ &= e_F(\sigma_0[0,1]) + e_F(c[t_0+2, t_1]) + e_F(\sigma_1[0,2]) \\ &\leq c_F^2 e_{|.|}(\sigma_0[0,1]) + e_F(c[t_0+2, t_1]) + c_F^2 e_{|.|}(\sigma_1[0,2]). \end{aligned}$$

If $\sigma : [a,b] \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is a straight Euclidean segment, then we find

$$e_{|.|}(\sigma[a,b]) = \frac{|\sigma(b) - \sigma(a)|^2}{b-a}$$

and hence by definition of σ_0, σ_1

$$\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ &\leq c_F^2 \left(e_{|.|}(\sigma_0[0,1]) + e_{|.|}(\sigma_1[0,2]) \right) \\ &= c_F^2 \left(|c(t_0+2) - c(t_0) - e_1|^2 + \frac{1}{2}|c(t_1+1) - c(t_1) + e_1|^2 \right) \\ &= c_F^2 \Bigg(|c(t_0+2) - c(t_0)|^2 - 2[c_1(t_0+2) - c_1(t_0)] + 1 \\ &\qquad + \frac{1}{2}|c(t_1+1) - c(t_1)|^2 + [c_1(t_1+1) - c_1(t_1)] + \frac{1}{2} \Bigg), \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & 6/c_F^2 - 3 + 4[c_1(t_0+2) - c_1(t_0)] \\ &\leq 2|c(t_0+2) - c(t_0)|^2 + |c(t_1+1) - c(t_1)|^2 \\ &\qquad + 2[c_1(t_1+1) - c_1(t_1)], \end{aligned}$$

Due to uniform equivalence of F and $|.|$, $F(\dot{c}) = 1$ and l_F-minimality of c we have for all $t \in [0, L]$ and $T \in [0, L-t]$

$$\begin{aligned} T/c_F &= d_F(c(t), c(t+T))/c_F \\ &\leq |c(t+T) - c(t)| \\ &\leq c_F d_F(c(t), c(t+T)) = c_F T. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

This shows

$$6/c_F^2 - 3 + 4[c_1(t_0+2) - c_1(t_0)] \leq 9c_F^2 + 2[c_1(t_1+1) - c_1(t_1)],$$

and if $c_F \in [1, 1.016]$, then one finds

$$6/c_F^2 - 3 - 9c_F^2 \geq -6.5.$$

Hence, if $[c_1(t_0+2)-c_1(t_0)] \geq 7/4$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 1/4 &\leq \frac{1}{2}\left(6/c_F^2 - 3 - 9c_F^2 + 4[c_1(t_0+2)-c_1(t_0)]\right) \\ &\leq c_1(t_1+1)-c_1(t_1). \end{aligned}$$

Let us see that for good choices of X we can assume the existence of $t_0 \in [0, L]$ with $[c_1(t_0+2)-c_1(t_0)] \geq 7/4$. We assume the contrary, i.e.

$$[c_1(t+2)-c_1(t)] \leq 7/4 \qquad \forall t \in [0, L-2]. \tag{6}$$

Using (5) and Pythagoras' theorem we then find[1]

$$\begin{aligned} |c_2(t+2)-c_2(t)|^2 &= |c(t+2)-c(t)|^2 - |c_1(t+2)-c_1(t)|^2 \\ &\geq 4/c_F^2 - (7/4)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Again, if $c_F \in [1, 1.016]$, then $\varepsilon := 4/c_F^2 - (7/4)^2 > 0$. Hence, for c_F sufficiently close to 1 the c_2-part of c grows linearly like $\varepsilon/2$ in time 1. If X is chosen to lie close to the x_1-axis in $\mathbb{R}^2$, then under the assumption (6), c cannot connect $-X$ to X.

We saw that for X close to the x_1-axis we obtain a minimal geodesic segment c with uniformly positive average displacement along the $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$-factor of M, i.e. at least $1/4$ in time 1. We find for each such X with $X_2 > 0$ a point of intersection in $c[0, L] \cap \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$ and applying deck-transformations of the covering $\mathbb{R}^2 \to M$ yields a minimal geodesic with initial point in $[0, 1] \times \{0\}$, having positive average displacement along the $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$-factor. The theorem follows. □

Remark 6.5. (1) Several arguments in the preceding proof are a bit crude. Being more careful, one could possibly obtain more information on the constructed minimal geodesic, as well as on the parameter range for c_F, which was

$$c_F \in [1, 1.016].$$

(2) Note that the topology of $M = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\dim M = 2$ were only used in few places. Hence, one might try to generalize Theorem 6.4 to more general manifolds having a Euclidean background structure.

Let us prove the following lemma, which might render some arguments more precise. It shows that minimal segments cannot wander to far from model geodesics in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

[1]Here we have to work a bit more: (6) is an assumption on $c_1(t+2)-c_1(t)$, while we need an estimate for its absolute value...

Lemma 6.6. *Let F be any Finsler metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$ uniformly equivalent to the Euclidean norm $|.|$ via a constant $c_F \geq 1$. If $c : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ minimizes the F-length between its endpoints and if $F(\dot{c}) = \text{const.}$, then $c(1/2)$ lies R-close to the midpoint $\frac{1}{2}(c(1)+c(0))$ (with respect to the Euclidean distance), where*

$$R = |c(1) - c(0)| \cdot \frac{\sqrt{c_F^2 - 1}}{2}.$$

Proof. c minimizes the energy between its endpoints in connection time 1. If

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(t) &= (1-t)c(0) + tc(1), && t \in [0,1], \\ \sigma_0(t) &= (1-2t)c(0) + 2tc(1/2), && t \in [0,1/2], \\ \sigma_1(t) &= (1-2t)c(1/2) + 2tc(1), && t \in [1/2,1], \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &2|c(1/2) - c(0)|^2 + 2|c(1) - c(1/2)|^2 = e_{|.|}(\sigma_0) + e_{|.|}(\sigma_1) \\ &\leq e_{|.|}(c[0,1/2]) + e_{|.|}(c[1/2,1]) \leq c_F^2 e_F(c) \leq c_F^2 e_F(\sigma) = c_F^2 |c(1) - c(0)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

This inequality can be brought via the isometry group of $(\mathbb{R}^n, |.|)$ into a new position, such that w.l.o.g. $c(0) = 0, c(1) = \lambda e_1$ with $\lambda = |c(1) - c(0)|$ and $x := c(1/2)$ in the (x_1, x_2)-plane. We then find

$$2|x|^2 - 2\lambda x_1 + \lambda^2 = |x|^2 + |\lambda e_1 - x|^2 \leq \frac{c_F^2 \lambda^2}{2}.$$

Observe that

$$|x - \tfrac{\lambda}{2} e_1|^2 = |x|^2 - \lambda x_1 + \lambda^2/2 - \lambda^2/2 + \lambda^2/4 = \tfrac{1}{2}(|x|^2 + |\lambda e_1 - x|^2) - \lambda^2/4,$$

hence

$$|x - \tfrac{\lambda}{2} e_1|^2 \leq \tfrac{c_F^2 \lambda^2}{4} - \lambda^2/4 = \lambda^2 (c_F^2 - 1)/4.$$

The lemma follows. □

6.4. **Rational directions in higher dimensions.** Let (M, g) be a compact manifold of strictly negative curvature and of arbitrary dimension. By M being compact, there is a negative upper bound for the sectional curvatures of g and the Morse Lemma holds. In this subsection we discuss a theorem showing that in the periodic directions, there are always unstable rays (see Definition 4.12). In dimension two this was shown in Theorem 6.1 (ii).

Let $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\text{id}\}$. By Preissmann's theorem, the group $\langle \tau \rangle \subset \Gamma$ generated by τ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. We consider the "cylinder"

$$C_\tau := H / \langle \tau \rangle$$

with the covering map denoted by

$$p_\tau : H \to C_\tau.$$

C_τ is homeomorphic to $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{R}^{\dim M-1}$. Let us denote by

$$\gamma_\tau : \mathbb{R} \to H$$

the unique τ-periodic g-geodesic. The set $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau)$ is invariant under $D\tau$. We shall consider the ϕ_F^t-invariant measures in the quotient

$$\mathcal{M}_\tau := \mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau)/\langle D\tau \rangle = Dp_\tau(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau)) \subset S_F C_\tau.$$

Recall the definition of the set $\mathcal{A}_-(\xi_\tau)$ of unstable rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi_\tau)$, where $\xi_\tau = \gamma_\tau(-\infty)$. We can prove the following fact, which recovers the fact from Mather theory, that the Mather set is always contained in the Aubry set (Remark 5.4).

Theorem 6.7. *Let μ be a ϕ_F^t-invariant measure supported in the quotient $\mathcal{M}_\tau$ and let $\widetilde{\operatorname{supp}\mu} = Dp_\tau^{-1}(\operatorname{supp}\mu)$ be the lifted support of μ. Then*

$$\widetilde{\operatorname{supp}\mu} \subset \mathcal{A}_-(\xi_\tau).$$

In particular, $\mathcal{A}_-(\xi_\tau) \neq \emptyset$.

We give the proof of Theorem 6.7. It recovers the argument in the proof of Theorem 6.1 (ii) above, which will appear again in Subsection 7.2. By the techniques in the proof of Theorem 6.7 (see also Subsection 7.2), one might be able to answer the following.

Problem 6.8. *Let $\operatorname{Rec}(\phi_F^t|_{Dp(\mathcal{M})}) \subset S_F M$ be the set of (forward and backward) recurrent minimal geodesics and let $\mathcal{A} \subset S_F H$ the set of (forward and backward) unstable minimal geodesics. Is it true that*

$$Dp^{-1}(\operatorname{Rec}(\phi_F^t|_{Dp(\mathcal{M})})) \subset \mathcal{A}?$$

Proof of Theorem 6.7. Note that

$$H_1(C_\tau, \mathbb{R}) \cong \mathbb{R}, \qquad H^1(C_\tau, \mathbb{R}) \cong \mathbb{R}^*.$$

As in Section 5, we can define minimizing measures in $S_F C_\tau$, which will be supported in $\mathcal{M}_\tau$. This singles out a unique cohomology class $[\eta] \in H^1(C_\tau, \mathbb{R})$ (by $\dim H^1(C_\tau, \mathbb{R}) = 1$) with $\rho(\mu)([\eta]) = 1$ for all measures supported in $\mathcal{M}_\tau$. Moreover, if ν is any ϕ_F^t-invariant measure in $S_F C_\tau$, then $\rho(\nu)([\eta]) \leq 1$. (Note that C_τ is non-compact, but the Morse Lemma can be used to overcome difficulties.) We use the closed 1-form η for the definition of the "distance" $d_{F-\eta}$ in C_τ. Using $d_{F-\eta}$, one finds that the orbits c_v with $v \in \widetilde{\operatorname{supp}\mu}$ are $[\eta]$-semistatic, see Lemma 5.2 (iv).

Assume now that $v \in \widetilde{\operatorname{supp}\mu}$ and that $w \in \mathcal{R}_-(\xi_\tau)$ with $\pi v = \pi w$. We have to show $v = w$ and assume the contrary. We then find $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, such that

$$d_F(c_w(-\delta), c_v(\delta)) \leq 2\delta - \varepsilon. \tag{7}$$

The first step is to find a suitable recurrent geodesic in the α-limit set of c_w. For this we work in the quotient C_τ. Let ν be a ϕ_F^t-invariant probability measure supported in the limit set $\alpha(\phi_F^t, w)$, which lies in $\mathcal{M}_\tau$ (by the Morse Lemma, the geodesic $p \circ c_w$ stays in a compact part of C_τ). We consider the product probability space $(\mathcal{M}_\tau \times \mathcal{M}_\tau, \mu \otimes \nu)$ with the flow $\phi_F^t \times \phi_F^t$, which preserves the product measure $\mu \otimes \nu$. By the Poincaré recurrence theorem, $\mu \otimes \nu$-almost every (v', w') is recurrent. Since we are considering the product measure, we find a sequence $v_k \to v$ in $\operatorname{supp}\mu$ and for each k a ν-full measure set $A_k \subset \operatorname{supp}\nu$, such that the points (v_k, w') with $w' \in A_k$ are backwards $\phi_F^t \times \phi_F^t$-recurrent. We choose any point $w' \in \bigcap_{k\in\mathbb{N}} A_k$ (which has full ν-measure and hence is non-empty). Fixing k, this means that we find a sequence $T_{n,k} \to -\infty$ for $n \to \infty$ so that in $S_F C_\tau$

$$\phi_F^{T_{n,k}} v_k \to v_k, \qquad \phi_F^{T_{n,k}} w' \to w', \qquad n \to \infty. \tag{8}$$

Since $w' \in \operatorname{supp}\nu \subset \alpha(\phi_F^t, w)$, we find moreover by fixing n, k a sequence of times $S_{m,n,k} \to -\infty$ for $m \to \infty$ with

$$\operatorname{dist}_g(c_w[S_{m,n,k} + T_{n,k}, S_{m,n,k}], c_{w'}[T_{n,k}, 0]) \to 0, \qquad m \to \infty, \tag{9}$$

dist_g denoting the g-Hausdorff distance in C_τ.

We lift the situation to H. Let $h : H \to \mathbb{R}$ be a primitive of the lift $\tilde{\eta}$ of η to H. Note that, since η is τ-invariant, we have $d(h \circ \tau - h) = 0$ and hence $h \circ \tau - h = \kappa$ for some non-zero constant $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ ($\kappa \neq 0$, since otherwise η would be exact in C_τ, against $\rho(\mu)([\eta]) = 1$). It follows that

$$h \circ \tau^m - h = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^m h \circ \tau^i - h \circ \tau^{i-1} = m \cdot \kappa. \tag{10}$$

Next, we lift c_{v_k} and $c_{w'}$ to H (denoting the lifts by the same letters) in such a way that $c_{v_k}(0) \to c_v(0)$ as $k \to \infty$. By (8), we find sequences $m_n^{v_k}, m_n^{w'} \in \mathbb{Z}$ with

$$d_g(\tau^{m_n^{v_k}} c_{v_k}(0), c_{v_k}(T_{n,k})) \overset{n\to\infty}{\to} 0, \quad d_g(\tau^{m_n^{w'}} c_{w'}(0), c_{w'}(T_{n,k})) \overset{n\to\infty}{\to} 0. \tag{11}$$

We claim that $m_n := m_n^{w'} = m_n^{v_k}$ for sufficiently large n (here we use that $c_{v_k}, c_{w'}$ are *simultaneously* recurrent). For this observe that by



FIGURE 5. The argument in the proof of Theorem 6.7. Images of curves under τ^{-m_n} are depicted in gray.

(10) and c_{v_k} being $[\eta]$-semistatic

$$\begin{aligned}
&|-T_{n,k} + \kappa m_n^{v_k} - d_{F-\eta}(c_{v_k}(T_{n,k}), c_{v_k}(0))| \\
&= \left|-T_{n,k} + \left[h(\tau^{m_n^{v_k}} c_{v_k}(0)) - h(c_{v_k}(0))\right] - l_{F-\eta}(c_{v_k}[T_{n,k}, 0])\right| \\
&= \Big| - T_{n,k} + \left[h(\tau^{m_n^{v_k}} c_{v_k}(0)) - h(c_{v_k}(0))\right] + T_{n,k} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \left[h(c_{v_k}(0)) - h(c_{v_k}(T_{n,k}))\right]\Big| \\
&= \left|h(\tau^{m_n^{v_k}} c_{v_k}(0)) - h(c_{v_k}(T_{n,k}))\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

By (11), the last line tends to zero as $n \to \infty$. By (8) and the continuity of $d_{F-\eta}$, also the $d_{F-\eta}$-term in the first line tends to zero for $n \to \infty$. The analogous calculation for w' (which also minimizes $d_{F-\eta}$ by lying in the support of ν in $\mathcal{M}_\tau$) shows

$$|\kappa| \cdot \left|m_n^{v_k} - m_n^{w'}\right| = \left|\kappa m_n^{v_k} - \kappa m_n^{w'}\right| \to |T_{n,k} - T_{n,k}| = 0, \quad n \to \infty.$$

Since $m_n^{v_k}, m_n^{w'} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\kappa \neq 0$, the claim follows.

By (7), we obtain for sufficiently large k, n, that

$$d_F(c_w(-\delta), \tau^{-m_n} c_{v_k}(T_{n,k} + \delta)) \leq 2\delta - \varepsilon/2. \tag{12}$$

We now fix the lift $c_{w'}$, so that using (9) and (11) we have

$$d_F(\tau^{-m_n} c_w(S_{m,n,k} + T_{n,k}), c_w(S_{m,n,k})) \leq \varepsilon/8. \tag{13}$$

(Note that the choice of the lift of $c_{w'}$ depends on m, n, k, which we suppress in the notation.) Using the minimality of c_w in H, the triangle inequality, $\pi v = \pi w$, $v_k \to v$, (12) and (13) we find for large m, n, k

(cf. Figure 5)

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\quad -(S_{m,n,k}+T_{n,k})\\
&= d_F(\tau^{-m_n}c_w(S_{m,n,k}+T_{n,k}),\tau^{-m_n}c_w(0))\\
&\le d_F(\tau^{-m_n}c_w(S_{m,n,k}+T_{n,k}),c_w(S_{m,n,k}))+d_F(c_w(S_{m,n,k}),c_w(-\delta))\\
&+ d_F(c_w(-\delta),\tau^{-m_n}c_{v_k}(T_{n,k}+\delta))+d_F(\tau^{-m_n}c_{v_k}(T_{n,k}+\delta),\tau^{-m_n}c_{v_k}(0))\\
&+ d_F(\tau^{-m_n}c_{v_k}(0),\tau^{-m_n}c_v(0))\\
&\le \varepsilon/8-(\delta+S_{m,n,k})+(2\delta-\varepsilon/2)-(T_{n,k}+\delta)+\varepsilon/8\\
&= -(S_{m,n,k}+T_{n,k})-\varepsilon/4.
\end{aligned}
$$

This is a contradiction. □

6.5. **Multiplicity of shortest closed geodesics.** In Remark 3.2 we observed that each free homotopy class of a closed surface M entails minimal geodesics. Such minimal geodesics may foliate strips in M, i.e. there may be infinitely many shortest closed geodesics in a single homotopy class. But one does not expend this to be the case for "typical" Finsler metrics F.

We let here M be a closed manifold of arbitrary dimension. Let us first see what we mean by "typical". In [Mañ96], R. Mañé perturbed a given Lagrangian $L : TM \to \mathbb{R}$ by a potential function $U : M \to \mathbb{R}$, namely considering the new Lagrangian

$$L' = L + U \circ \pi,$$

where $\pi : TM \to M$ is the canonical projection. Properties of L' for generic choices of the potential U have been studied by Mañé in [Mañ96] and e.g. by P. Bernard and G. Contreras in [BC08]. In the geometric setting we use a different kind of perturbation, which is related to the before mentioned one via Maupertuis' principle. Namely, if $L = \frac{1}{2}|.|_g^2$ is the kinetic energy associated to the Riemannian metric g, then $L' = L + U \circ \pi$ defines a mechanical Lagrangian and the solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equations associated to L' of energy κ are reparametrized geodesics in the so-called Jacobi metric $g' = (\kappa + U) \cdot g$. Hence, perturbing L by adding a potential corresponds to perturbing the metric g by a conformal function. We write

$$E := \{\lambda \in C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R}) : \lambda(x) > 0 \ \forall x \in M\}$$

and endow E with the C^∞-topology. By a *residual subset* of E we mean a countable intersection of open and dense subsets of E. As E is an open subset of a Fréchet space, residual sets are dense in E.

Definition 6.9. *A property of Finsler metrics is said to be* conformally generic *if for any given Finsler metric F_0 on M there exists a residual subset $\mathcal{O} \subset E$, so that the property holds for all Finsler metrics F of the form*

$$F(v) = f(\pi v) \cdot F_0(v)$$

with $f \in \mathcal{O}$.

By abuse of language, we will also call the Finsler metrics fF_0, $f \in \mathcal{O}$ conformally generic. Observe that if F_0 is e.g. Riemannian, then so are the perturbed Finsler metrics $F = f \cdot F_0$.

In [Sch15e], the author proved the following theorem.

Theorem 6.10. *The property to admit in each free homotopy class, which is not of order 2, precisely one shortest closed geodesic is conformally generic for Finsler metrics on closed manifolds.*

If M is a closed, orientable surface, then any homotopy class is of infinite order. Applying Theorem 6.10, this means in the case of genus $\mathfrak{g} = 1$, that $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau) \subset S_F H$ consists generically precisely of the $\Gamma \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$-translates of a single τ-periodic geodesic, for each $\tau \in \Gamma$. In particular, there will be neighboring periodic minimals and heteroclinic connections between them. In the higher genus case $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$, then generically $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau) \subset S_F H$ consists of a single F-geodesic. All rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi_\tau)$ are asymptotic to this minimal geodesic.

Theorem 6.10 rests on an abstract result, which was in a slightly different form proved by Mañé in [Mañ96]. We state Theorem 2.1 from [Sch15e], which can be applied to prove Theorem 6.10.

Theorem 6.11. *Let V be a first-countable, Hausdorff topological $\mathbb{R}$-vector space and $E \subset V$ an open subset. Moreover, let X be a metrizable topological space. We consider a function*

$$\varphi : X \times E \to \mathbb{R}$$

with the following properties:

- *(regularity) φ is continuous and $\varphi(x, .)$ is differentiable for fixed x. We write $D_V\varphi(x, f)[v]$ for the derivative and assume moreover, that this is continuous in all components x, f, v.*
- *(compactness) For fixed $f \in E$, the function $\varphi(., f)$ attains its infimum in a non-empty set $M(f) \subset X$ and if $\{f_n\} \subset E$ is a convergent sequence with limit in E, then the union $\bigcup M(f_n)$ is contained in a compact subset of X.*
- *(non-degeneracy) For each $f \in E$, the derivative of φ separates the set of minimizers $M(f)$ in the sense that*

$$\forall x \neq y \text{ in } X \ \exists v \in V : \quad D_V\varphi(x, f)[v] \neq D_V\varphi(y, f)[v].$$

Then there exists a residual subset $\mathcal{O} \subset E$, so that

$$f \in \mathcal{O} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \operatorname{card} M(f) = 1.$$

In order to prove Theorem 6.10 one makes the following definitions:

- $V = C^\infty(M, \mathbb{R})$ with the C^∞-topology and E the subset of positive functions.
- X is the space of smooth curves $c : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to M$ in a fixed free homotopy class modulo parametrization, endowed with the C^1-topology.
- φ is given by the length, namely $\varphi(c, f) = l_{f \cdot F_0}(c; [0, 1])$, where F_0 is a fixed Finsler metric.

The approach via Theorem 6.11 could have more applications. In a similar procedure, one should be able to show that mass minimizing currents in homology classes $h \in H_k(M, \mathbb{Z})$ become unique. Moreover, fixing a boundary integral current, solutions to the corresponding Plateau problem in M should become unique.

Let us also mention that it could be possible using Theorem 6.11 to show that the minimizing measures in Theorem 6.7 are unique for conformally generic F. Here the term "minimizing" is understood in the sense of Section 5. See also the arguments in [Mañ96]. This would generalize the fact that generically, the set $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\tau)$ consists of a single minimal geodesic, if $\dim M = 2$. Possibly, the dynamics in the support of such a measure are special in some sense, as the support is uniquely ergodic. This could be a step towards solving Problem 3.6. Possibly this also implies that for generic F, the directed weak KAM solution in $\delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$ is unique for ξ a fixed point of the group Γ.

7. Irrational directions

Let M be a closed, orientable surface. The Morse Lemma holds for a constant curvature metric g and we defined the sets $\Pi_M \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ of rational directions and $\mathbb{S}^1 - \Pi_M$ of irrational directions in Subsection 2.4. In Subsection 6.1, we described the structure of $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ for rational ξ. Here, we treat irrational ξ. The dynamics depend on the genus $\mathfrak{g}$ being equal to 1 or ≥ 2.

7.1. **The genus one case.** Let $\mathfrak{g} = 1$, i.e. $M = \mathbb{T}^2$. The following theorem was proved by Bangert [Ban88] and independently by Bialy and Polterovich [BP86], assuming that F is reversible. For general Finsler metrics F, see [Sch15a]. Given $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$, let $\gamma_\xi : \mathbb{R} \to H$ be a g-geodesic of the form $\gamma_\xi(t) = x + t\xi$, i.e. with asymptotic directions

$\gamma(\pm\infty) = \xi$. Recall that the sets $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi) \subset \mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ are Γ-invariant. We write

$$\mathcal{M}^{rec}(\gamma_\xi) := \{v \in \mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi) \mid \widehat{\dot{p \circ c_v}} : \mathbb{R} \to S_F\mathbb{T}^2 \text{ is bi-recurrent}\}.$$

Theorem 7.1. *Let $M = \mathbb{T}^2$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 - \Pi_M$ be irrational. Then the following hold:*

(i) The set $\mathcal{M}^{rec}(\gamma_\xi) \subset \mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi)$ is closed and minimal for ϕ_F^t, i.e. it contains no non-trivial, closed, ϕ_F^t-invariant subsets.
(ii) The projection $\pi(\mathcal{M}^{rec}(\gamma_\xi)) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is either nowhere dense in $\mathbb{R}^2$ or equal to $\mathbb{R}^2$.
(iii) Any ray in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ is asymptotic to some minimal geodesic in $\mathcal{M}^{rec}(\gamma_\xi)$. The same is true for $\mathcal{R}_+(-\xi)$.
(iv) No two rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ intersect.

Item (iv) means that all rays in $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ are unstable. Observe that due to Γ-invariance of the set $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$, the projected rays in $Dp(\mathcal{R}_-(\xi))$ do not intersect in $\mathbb{T}^2$.

7.2. **The higher genus case.** In this subsection, we let $(M = H/\Gamma, g)$ be a connected, orientable, complete Riemannian surface with constant curvature -1. The universal cover (H, g) is the Poincaré disc. Recall that two rays $\gamma, \gamma' : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ with $\gamma(-\infty) = \gamma'(-\infty)$ are asymptotic with respect to g in the strong sense that $d_g(\gamma(-t), \gamma'(\mathbb{R}_-)) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. We shall need the following property of points ξ in the Gromov boundary $\mathrm{Gro}(H, g) \cong \mathbb{S}^1$.

Definition 7.2. *A point $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ is called* α-compact *(with respect to Γ acting on $H \cup \mathbb{S}^1$), if for one and hence for all g-rays $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_- \to H$ the α-limit set of the projected ray $\widehat{\dot{p \circ \gamma}} : \mathbb{R}_- \to S_gM$ contains a non-empty, compact subset left invariant by the g-geodesic flow.*

Note that if M is compact, then every point $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ is α-compact.

Let F be a Finsler metric on M uniformly equivalent to g. The Morse Lemma holds. The main result in this subsection is the following, proved by the author in [Sch15d].

Theorem 7.3. *If $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ is α-compact and if ξ is not fixed by a hyperbolic element of Γ, then for all $v, w \in \mathcal{R}_-(\xi)$ we have*

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty} d_g(c_v(\mathbb{R}_-), c_w(-t)) = 0.$$

Hence, $w_-(\xi) = 0$ (see Definition 3.3).

In essence, Theorem 7.3 recovers a fact known from the case where F is Riemannian and of negative curvature: if two geodesics stay at finite distance, then by the flat strip theorem, they have to be asymptotic

in the strong sense. For general Finsler metrics F with no curvature assumptions, this is not at all clear. Note that Theorem 7.3 is in general false for $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ being fixed under a hyperbolic element of Γ: imagine a surface of genus two with two thin waists forming shortest closed geodesics, bounding a thickened annulus; here the closed geodesics are minimal (Subsection 6.1) and at uniformly positive distance. Theorem 7.3 shows, however, that such such a thickened annulus is the only situation, in which two rays can stay in distance bounded from above and below by positive constants. Observe also that Theorem 7.3 is false for $M = \mathbb{T}^2$, i.e. it depends on the hyperbolicity of the background metric g.

Combining Theorem 7.3 with Lemma 2.6, we obtain Theorem 7.1 (iv) for higher genus surfaces.

Theorem 7.4. *Let M be a closed, orientable surface of genus at least two. Then, in the universal cover, no two (backward) rays with the same irrational asymptotic direction can intersect.*

We give a brief overview on the proof of Theorem 7.3, referring to [Sch15d] for the details. The underlying idea is similar to the proof of Theorem 6.7.

Idea of the proof of Theorem 7.3. For $\xi \in \mathrm{Gro}(H, g)$ being α-compact, choose a subset $G \subset S_g M$ of the α-limit set of a g-ray γ with $\gamma(-\infty) = \xi$, which is compact, ϕ_g^t-invariant and minimal (contains no non-trivial, closed, invariant subsets). Assume that the width $w_-(\xi) > 0$ and let γ' be a g-geodesic lifted from G. As G is minimal, γ' is recurrent under a sequence $\{\tau_n\} \subset \Gamma$ and by Proposition 3.4 $w_0(\gamma') > 0$. The first step is to find two minimal geodesics c_0, c_1 in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma')$, which are forward recurrent under the given sequence $\{\tau_n\}$ and which stay at a uniformly positive distance (using $w_0(\gamma') > 0$). The approximation of γ' by γ under the group Γ can then be used to obtain a forward ray c initiating transversely from $c_0(\mathbb{R})$, say, with $c(\infty) = c_0(\infty)$. Then one proves that in the ω-limit set of c, there is a minimal geodesic in $\mathcal{M}(\gamma')$, which is recurrent under the same sequence $\{\tau_n\}$ as c_0, and which has the same recurrence times $T_n \to \infty$, as c_0. For this latter fact, one uses a recurrent, directed weak KAM solution given by Corollary 4.16 (in the proof of Theorem 6.7, we used simultaneous recurrence and the fact that the occurring orbits were semistatic in C_τ). Now one proceeds as in the proof of Theorem 6.7, replacing c_v by c_0 and c_w by c, to obtain a contradiction. □

We described in Theorems 6.1 and 7.4 the structure of the set of rays $\mathcal{R}_- \subset S_F H$ and minimal geodesics $\mathcal{M} \subset S_F H$. Many of the

results resemble the dynamics in negative curvature. In particular, one can ask whether there are dense geodesics in the set $Dp(\mathcal{M}) \subset S_F M$, of whether the periodic geodesics are dense in $Dp(\mathcal{M})$. For this, see Section 13 in [HM42] and the theorem in §3.5 in [Kli71]. Also observe that Zaustinsky shows transitivity under an assumption on the uniqueness of rays, cf. Theorem 6.4 in [Zau62].

Another problem is the following.

Problem 7.5. *Can* $\liminf$ *be replaced by* $\lim$ *in Theorem 7.3?*

Relaxing the question, one can ask whether the distance function $a(t) := d_g(c_v(\mathbb{R}_-), c_w(-t))$ has time-average equal to zero. This would imply that for absolutely continuous functions $f : \mathcal{R}_-(\xi) \to \mathbb{R}$, the time average is constant. This plays a role in the ergodicity of invariant measures in $Dp(\mathcal{M}) \subset S_F M$. For the latter condition observe that by the techniques in [Sch15d], for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a length $L(\varepsilon) < \infty$, so that the function $a(t)$ cannot be $\geq \varepsilon$ on intervals of length $\geq L(\varepsilon)$. Considering the sets $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : a(-n) \geq \varepsilon\}$ leads to notions like piecewise syndetic sets and the density of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ in number theory. One should be able to link these notions to recurrence in the dynamics of ϕ_g^t, see [Fur81].

Problem 7.5 was originally motivated by the construction of measures of maximal entropy in $Dp(\mathcal{M})$ proposed by Knieper, see [Kni98]. Solving the above problems can be used in proving ergodicity and uniqueness of the arising measure. Such measures in the set of minimal geodesics generalize the ergodic Lebesgue measure in the unit tangent bundle in the case of negative curvature. Note also the calculation of the topological entropy in the set $Dp(\mathcal{M})$ in Subsection 9.1.

8. Applications to Mather theory, weak KAM solutions and average actions

In this section we apply the structure results discussed in Sections 6 and 7 to the notions introduced in Sections 4 and 5, assuming that M is a closed, orientable surface of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 1$. (Observe that the structure of the set of minimal geodesics applies also in the non-orientable case, after moving to the orientable double cover – minimal geodesics are defined in the universal cover –, so one can apply our previous results to the study of the non-orientable case as in [BM07].)

8.1. **The genus one case.** Let $\mathfrak{g} = 1$, i.e. $M = \mathbb{T}^2$. Recall that $\Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2} \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ was in this case the set of points with rational or infinite slope. We have $c(\infty) = c(-\infty)$ if c is a minimal geodesic, as minimal

geodesics shadow straight lines. Given $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$, we shall write γ_ξ for a straight Euclidean line of the form $\gamma_\xi(t) = x + t\xi$, i.e. with $\gamma_\xi(\pm\infty) = \xi$.

We wish to describe the Mather, Aubry and Mañé sets defined in Section 5. The general reference for the proofs is [Sch15a]. The first observation was made before, namely that for any η-weak KAM solution $[u]$, the Mather set $\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]}$ consists of $[u]$-calibrated curves. Hence, if $c : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is a geodesic projecting into the Mather set $\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]} \subset S_F\mathbb{T}^2$ and if $c' : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ projects to any $[\eta]$-semistatic curve in $\mathbb{T}^2$, then the two minimal geodesics c, c' cannot intersect in $\mathbb{R}^2$. This leads to the following observation.

Proposition 8.1. *All minimal geodesics $c : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ projecting to the Mañé set $\mathcal{N}_{[\eta]}$ have a common asymptotic direction $c(-\infty)$.*

Using the above observations one can relate the asymptotic direction to Mather's α-function.

Theorem 8.2. *Mather's α-function $\alpha_F : H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) - \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}$ is C^1, hence its convex conjugate $\beta_F : H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) - \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}$ is strictly convex. The asymptotic direction of a minimal geodesic $c : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ projecting into the Mañé set $\mathcal{N}_{[\eta]}$ for $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F) = \{\alpha_F = 1/2\}$ is given by*

$$c(-\infty) = \frac{\nabla\alpha([\eta])}{|\nabla\alpha([\eta])|} \in \mathbb{S}^1.$$

Equivalently, the asymptotic direction $c(-\infty)$ of (lifts of) $[\eta]$-semistatic rays $c : \mathbb{R}_- \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is given by the unique vector $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \cong H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$ with the property

$$\langle\, \xi, [\eta] \,\rangle = \max\{\langle\, \xi, [\eta'] \,\rangle : [\eta'] \in B^*(F)\}.$$

Given a point $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$, we consider the *face of direction* ξ

$$\mathcal{F}_\xi := \left\{ [\eta] \in \partial B^*(F) : \langle\, \xi, [\eta] \,\rangle = \max_{[\eta'] \in B^*(F)} \langle\, \xi, [\eta'] \,\rangle \right\}.$$

It follows from Theorem 8.2, that for $[\eta] \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$, the asymptotic direction of (lifts of) $[\eta]$-semistatic rays c is $c(-\infty) = \xi$.

Recall that η-weak KAM solutions $[u] \in C^0(\mathbb{T}^2)/_\sim$ can be lifted to weak KAM solutions $[\tilde{u}] \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{R}^2, F)$, see Proposition 5.8.

Corollary 8.3. *If $[u]$ is an η-weak KAM solution for some $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F)$, then the lift $[\tilde{u}]$ is directed and*

$$\delta_F([\tilde{u}]) = \frac{\nabla\alpha([\eta])}{|\nabla\alpha([\eta])|}.$$

The following result was originally proved by Bangert in [Ban94].

Theorem 8.4. *If $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 - \Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$ is irrational, then* $\operatorname{card} \mathcal{F}_\xi = 1$ *and given a closed 1-form η on $\mathbb{T}^2$ with $\mathcal{F}_\xi = \{[\eta]\}$, the η-weak KAM solution $[u]$ is unique. Moreover,*

$$\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]} = Dp(\mathcal{M}^{rec}(\gamma_\xi)) \quad \subset \quad \mathcal{A}_{[\eta]} = \mathcal{N}_{[\eta]} = Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi)).$$

We can also describe the Mather set in rational directions.

Theorem 8.5. *If $\xi \in \Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$ is rational, then for $[\eta] \in \mathcal{F}_\xi$ we have*

$$\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]} = Dp(\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi)).$$

Although we have not proved this, we expect that for rational ξ, the Aubry set $\mathcal{A}_{[\eta]}$ equals the Mañé set $\mathcal{N}_{[\eta]}$ for $[\eta]$ being an endpoint of the segment $\mathcal{F}_\xi \subset \partial B^*(F)$ and equals the Mather set $\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]}$ for $[\eta]$ in the interior of the segment $\mathcal{F}_\xi \subset \partial B^*(F)$. Moreover, if $\mathcal{F}_\xi$ has endpoints $[\eta_0], [\eta_1]$ ordered in the counterclockwise orientation of the closed curve $\partial B^*(F)$, then we expect

$$\mathcal{A}_{[\eta_i]} = \mathcal{N}_{[\eta_i]} = Dp\left(\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\tau) \cup (\mathcal{R}^i_-(\xi_\tau) \cap \mathcal{M})\right), \qquad i = 0, 1$$

in the notation explained after Theorem 6.1. These sets are the curves calibrated on $\mathbb{R}$ with respect to the weak KAM solutions $[u_i]$ given by Proposition 4.15.

Recall that in Subsection 5.2 we also defined a Mather set $\mathcal{M}^h$ for $h \in \partial B(F) = \{\beta_F = 1/2\}$. But using Remark 4.26 (ii) in [Sor10] and the fact that α_F is C^1, one sees that

$$\mathcal{M}^{\nabla \alpha_F([\eta])} = \mathcal{M}_{[\eta]},$$

while the map $\nabla \alpha_F : H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) \to H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$ is surjective. Hence, our description of the Mather sets $\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]}$ suffices in order to describe also the Mather sets $\mathcal{M}^h$.

Recall that an $[\eta]$-semistatic curve $c : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{T}^2$ lifts to a minimal geodesic $\tilde{c} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$, for any $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F)$. In general, however, the set of minimal geodesics will be much larger than the set of lifts of lifts of semistatic curves. In the case of the 2-torus, the converse holds.

Proposition 8.6.

$$Dp(\mathcal{M}) = \bigcup \{\mathcal{N}_{[\eta]} : [\eta] \in \partial B^*(F)\}.$$

The analogous result holds for (backward and forward) rays.

We now discuss directed weak KAM solutions (which contain the lifts of η-weak KAM solutions for any $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F)$ by Corollary 8.3) and properties of Mather's α- and β-function. Recall from Subsection 4.1 that $\delta_F : \mathcal{W}_{dir}(\mathbb{R}^2, F) \to \mathrm{Gro}(\mathbb{R}^2, g) \cong \mathbb{S}^1$ is the map associating to $[u]$ the asymptotic direction $c(-\infty)$ of the $[u]$-calibrated rays c.

Theorem 8.7. *Let $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$.*

(i) If $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 - \Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$, then $\operatorname{card} \delta_F^{-1}(\xi) = 1$.

(ii) If $\xi \in \Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$, then $\operatorname{card} \delta_F^{-1}(\xi) = 1$ if and only if $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi) = \mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi)$, i.e. if the torus $\mathbb{T}^2$ is foliated by shortest closed geodesics in the prime homotopy class in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}\xi \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$.

The uniqueness result for irrational ξ follows from Theorem 7.1. The characterization in the rational case follows from Theorem 6.1. It shows in particular, that $\operatorname{card} \delta_F^{-1}(\xi) = 1$ for rational ξ implies the existence of a continuous invariant graph $Dp(\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi))$ in $S_F\mathbb{T}^2$, which is also a C^0-KAM torus in the sense of Definition 2.2. By taking limits and recalling a celebrated result due to Hopf [Hop48], one obtains the following result.

Corollary 8.8. *The map $\delta_F : \mathcal{W}_{dir}(\mathbb{R}^2, F) \to \mathbb{S}^1$ is a homeomorphism if and only if ϕ_F^t is C^0-integrable, i.e. $S_F\mathbb{T}^2$ is foliated by continuous ϕ_F^t-invariant graphs of the form $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi))$. Equivalently, δ_F is a homeomorphism if and only if F has no conjugate points. If F is Riemannian, then this is the case if and only if the curvature of F vanishes identically.*

Analogously, one can use the horofunction compactification $\overline{i_F(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ of $(\mathbb{R}^2, F)$ in Corollary 8.8.

Theorem 8.7 is analogous to the following theorem concerning Mather's α- and β-functions. The result was first proved in [Mat90] for monotone twist maps and by different methods in [Ban94].

Theorem 8.9. *(i) β_F is always differentiable in $h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) - \{0\}$ with irrational slope.*

(ii) β_F is differentiable in $h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) - \{0\}$ with rational slope if and only if the torus $\mathbb{T}^2$ is foliated by shortest closed geodesics in the prime homotopy class in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}\xi \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$.

Note that the differentiability of β_F in $h \in H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) - \{0\}$ is equivalent to $\operatorname{card} \mathcal{F}_{h/|h|} = 1$. For irrational $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ this is always true, as was already stated in Theorem 8.4. Theorem 8.9 shows that Corollary 8.8 can also be stated in the form that β_F is C^1 or in the form that α_F is strictly convex. In this connection we refer also to [MS11].

Remark 8.10. We saw in Theorems 8.7 and 8.9, that $\mathcal{W}_{dir}(\mathbb{R}^2, F)$ shares many properties with $B^*(F)$. One should study such links more closely, possibly defining a map $\mathcal{W}_{dir}(\mathbb{R}^2, F) \to \partial B^*(F)$. This could also help to understand $B^*(F)$ in the case of a higher genus surface. Note that in that case, we will have a good understanding of the set $\mathcal{W}_{dir}(\mathbb{R}^2, F)$ in Subsection 8.2, while $B^*(F)$ remains a bit mysterious.

We will sketch parts of Mather's proof of Theorem 8.9, see [Mat90] and [Mat88], as the idea is useful for recent results obtained in [KS15]. Before this, we recall another way to obtain β_F. Recall the definition of the stable norm

$$\sigma_F = \sqrt{2\beta_F} : \mathbb{R}^2 \cong H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$$

in Subsection 5.2. In these standard coordinates, the homotopy classes $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ of free loops lie naturally in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Lemma 8.11. *For $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ we have*

$$\sigma_F(z) = \inf \{ l_F(c) : c \text{ a closed curve with homotopy class } z \}.$$

The object on the right hand side is also called the *marked length spectrum*. Note that the homogeneity of the right hand side follows from the fact that the shortest closed geodesics in the homotopy class kz are the k-th iterates of the minimizers in the class z, for $k \geq 0$. Observe also that there is an intuitive way to see the strict convexity of σ_F. Namely if $z, w \in \mathbb{Z}^2 - \{0\}$ are linearly independent, let c_z, c_w be shortest closed geodesics in the respective homotopy classes. As z, w are linearly independent, the lifts $\tilde{c}_z, \tilde{c}_w : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ intersect transversely in a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_F(z+w) &\leq d_F(x-z, x+w) \\ &< d_F(x-z, x) + d_F(x, x+w) = \sigma_F(z) + \sigma_F(w). \end{aligned}$$

The strict inequality follows from the transversality of the intersection.

Proof of Lemma 8.11. For $c : [0,T] \to \mathbb{T}^2$ a shortest closed geodesic in the homotopy class z, parametrized by arc length, let μ_c be the measure given by $\int f \, d\mu = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(\dot{c}) \, dt$. Then $\mu_c \in \mathfrak{M}(L_F)$ and μ_c is minimizing. For a lift $\tilde{c}$ of c to $\mathbb{R}^2$, identifying $H^1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R}) \cong (\mathbb{R}^2)^*$ we find

$$\rho(\mu_c)(\langle v, . \rangle) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \langle v, \dot{c} \rangle \, dt = \frac{1}{T} \langle v, \tilde{c}(T) - \tilde{c}(0) \rangle = \langle v, \frac{z}{T} \rangle .$$

Hence, $\rho(\mu_c) = z/T$. On the other hand, as μ_c is minimizing and supported in $S_F \mathbb{T}^2$, we have

$$\beta_F(\rho(\mu_c)) = \int L_F \, d\mu_c = 1/2,$$

showing by homogeneity

$$\beta_F(z) = T^2 \cdot \beta_F(z/T) = T^2/2.$$

The claim follows from $T = l_F(c)$. □

Note that σ_F as a convex function has one-sided derivatives. We shall write

$$D^+\sigma_F(h)[v] := \inf_{t>0} \frac{\sigma_F(h+tv)-\sigma_F(h)}{t} = \lim_{t\searrow 0} \frac{\sigma_F(h+tv)-\sigma_F(h)}{t}.$$

Sketch of "$\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi) \neq \mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi) \implies \sigma_F$ not differentiable in ξ". We assume for simplicity, that $\xi = (1,0) = e_1$ and that $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi)$ consists of the $\mathbb{Z}^2$-translates of a single minimal geodesic c_0. Write c_-, c_+ for a choice of heteroclinic connections between c_0 and $c_1 := c_0 + e_2$. Using e.g. the bounding weak KAM solutions $[u_0], [u_1]$ from Proposition 4.15, one can show after choosing appropriate parameters, that there exist $T_-, T_+ \in \mathbb{R}$ and a function $f(t) \searrow 0$, as $t \to 0$ with

$$f(t) \geq \begin{cases} d_F(c_0(-t), c_+(-t)) \\ d_F(c_+(T_+ + t), c_1(t)) \\ d_F(c_1(-t), c_-(-t)) \\ d_F(c_-(T_- + t), c_0(t)) \end{cases}.$$

Let us write $\theta = \sigma_F(e_1)$ for the period of c_0 and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ choose F-minimizing segments δ_n connecting $c_0(-n\theta/2)$ to $c_+(-n\theta/2)$ and ε_n connecting $c_+(T_+ + n\theta/2)$ to $c_1(n\theta/2)$. The concatenation $c_n := \delta_n * c_+|_{[-n\theta/2, n\theta/2+T_+]} * \varepsilon_n$ has endpoints congruent modulo $ne_1 + e_2$ and has length

$$\sigma_F(ne_1+e_2) \leq l_F(c_n) \leq T_+ + n\theta + 2f(n\theta). \tag{14}$$

This shows with $n\theta = \sigma_F(ne_1)$ and $f(n\theta) \to 0$, that

$$D^+\sigma_F(e_1)[e_2] = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sigma_F(ne_1+e_2) - \sigma_F(ne_1) \leq T_+.$$

It is not difficult to show also the reverse inequality. The analogous reasoning using c_- shows

$$D^+\sigma_F(e_1)[\pm e_2] = T_\pm.$$

Observe now that c_-, c_+ have a transverse intersection in a point $x \in c_-(\mathbb{R}) \cap c_+(\mathbb{R})$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & d_F(c_+(-n\theta/2, c_-(T_- + n\theta/2)) \\ \leq\ & d_F(c_+(-n\theta/2, x) + d_F(x, c_-(T_- + n\theta/2)) - \varepsilon, \\ & d_F(c_-(-n\theta/2, c_+(T_+ + n\theta/2)) \\ \leq\ & d_F(c_-(-n\theta/2, x) + d_F(x, c_+(T_+ + n\theta/2)) - \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ and n sufficiently large. This shows

$$\begin{aligned} 2n\theta &= d_F(c_0(-n\theta/2), c_0(n\theta/2)) + d_F(c_1(-n\theta/2), c_1(n\theta/2)) \\ &\leq 2f(n\theta/2) + d_F(c_+(-n\theta/2, x) + d_F(x, c_-(T_- + n\theta/2)) - \varepsilon \\ &\quad + 2f(n\theta/2) + d_F(c_-(-n\theta/2, x) + d_F(x, c_+(T_+ + n\theta/2)) - \varepsilon \\ &= 2f(n\theta/2) - 2\varepsilon + 2n\theta + T_+ + T_- \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$D^+\sigma_F(e_1)[e_2] + D^+\sigma_F(e_1)[-e_2] = T_+ + T_- \geq 2\varepsilon > 0,$$

showing that σ_F cannot be differentiable in e_1. □

Assuming that the closed geodesic c_0 in the above proof is hyperbolic, the heteroclinics c_-, c_+ belong to the (un)stable manifold of c_0. In this case, the function $f(t)$ is of the form $C \cdot \exp(-\lambda t)$ for real numbers $C, \lambda > 0$. From inequality (14), we obtain an immediate corollary observed in [KS15].

Corollary 8.12. *If $\xi \in \Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$ and if the set $Dp(\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi)) \subset S_F\mathbb{T}^2$ is uniformly hyperbolic for the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t, then there exist constants $C, \lambda, \varepsilon > 0$, so that for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with Euclidean norm $|v| \leq \varepsilon$*

$$\sigma_F(\xi + v) - \sigma_F(\xi) - D^+\sigma_F(\xi)[v] \leq |v| \cdot C \cdot \exp\left(-\lambda \cdot \frac{1}{|v|}\right).$$

See Figure 6 for the level set $\{\sigma_F = 1\} = \partial B(F)$ for the case where F is obtained from the rotational torus. Here, $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\pm e_1)$ consist of the inner, short closed geodesic, which is hyperbolic. The set $\{\sigma_F = 1\}$ looks like a straight line to both side of the vertices at $\pm e_1$, which resembles the fact that the function $t \mapsto tC\exp(-\lambda\frac{1}{t})$ in Corollary 8.12 vanishes in $t = 0$ to infinite order. Drawing the level set $\{\alpha_F = 1/2\} = \partial B^*(F)$, one sees "corners" at the ends of the segments $\mathcal{F}_{\pm e_1}$ corresponding to the "straight parts" of $\{\sigma_F = 1\} = \{\beta_F = 1/2\}$, even though α is C^1. See Subsection 5.2 of [KS15] for the details of this example.

Using the ideas in [Mat88], one can move from rational $\xi \in \Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$ to irrational $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 - \Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$ via the convexity of σ_F. This can be used to prove the differentiability of σ_F in irrational directions. Using this approach and the stronger estimate obtained in Corollary 8.12, one can show the following.

Theorem 8.13 ([KS15])**.** *If the Finsler metric F is chosen to be conformally generic (see Definition 6.9), if $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 - \Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$ is irrational and if the set $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi)) \subset S_F\mathbb{T}^2$ is uniformly hyperbolic for the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t, then there exist constants $C, \lambda > 0$, such that in all choices of rays*



FIGURE 6. $\{\sigma_F = 1\} = \partial B(F) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \cong H_1(\mathbb{T}^2, \mathbb{R})$ for F obtained from the rotational torus.

$R \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ emanating from the origin there exist sequences $v_n \to 0, v_n \neq 0$, so that

$$\sigma_F(\xi + v_n) - \sigma_F(\xi) - D\sigma_F(\xi)[v_n] \leq |v_n|^{1/4} \cdot C \cdot \exp\left(-\lambda \cdot \frac{1}{|v_n|^{1/4}}\right).$$

Let us note that the assumption that $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi))$ is uniformly hyperbolic is satisfied in many situations, see [KS15].

Proposition 8.14. *The following property of Finsler metrics on $\mathbb{T}^2$ is conformally generic: For an open and dense subset $U \subset \mathbb{S}^1$, the sets $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi))$ are uniformly hyperbolic for all $\xi \in U$. The set U strictly contains the set $\Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$ of rational points.*

Proposition 8.14 shows that the sets $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi))$ are often hyperbolic. On the other hand, using the KAM-theorem, the set $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi))$ is a smooth KAM-torus, if the Finsler metric F is close to a Finsler metric F_0 with an integrable geodesic flow (e.g. F_0 the Euclidean metric) and if the slope ξ_2/ξ_1 is a Diophantine number. In this case, we proved in [KS15] the following theorem, relying on ideas from [Sib04].

Theorem 8.15. *If $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 - \Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$ is an irrational point and if the set $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi)) \subset S_F\mathbb{T}^2$ is a smooth KAM-torus for the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t, then Mather's β-function β_F is strongly convex near ξ, that is, there exists a constant $C > 0$ with*

$$\beta_F(\xi + v) - \beta_F(\xi) - D\beta_F(\xi)[v] \geq C \cdot |v|^2$$

for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

The regularity of the KAM-torus $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi))$ in Theorem 8.15 has to be at least C^3 for our argument to work.

In Theorem 8.9 (ii) we gave for rational ξ a criterion on β_F equivalent to $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi)) = Dp(\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi))$ being a KAM-torus (of regularity C^0).

Theorems 8.13 and 8.15 are a first step in the direction of solving the following problem.

Problem 8.16. *Give a criterion on β_F near a given irrational direction $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 - \Pi_{\mathbb{T}^2}$, which is equivalent to the case where the set $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi))$ is a C^0-KAM-torus for the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t.*

8.2. **The higher genus case.** Let us now assume that the genus $\mathfrak{g}$ of the closed, orientable surface M is ≥ 2. Recall the map

$$\delta_F : \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, F) \to \mathrm{Gro}(H, g) \cong \mathbb{S}^1$$

defined in Subsection 4.1. We have the following result, which is analogous to Theorem 8.7.

Theorem 8.17. *Let $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$.*

(i) If $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1 - \Pi_M$, then $\operatorname{card} \delta_F^{-1}(\xi) = 1$.

(ii) If $\xi \in \Pi_M$, then $\operatorname{card} \delta_F^{-1}(\xi) = 1$ if and only if $\pi(\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi)) \subset H$ is connected, i.e. if the periodic minimal geodesics with endpoint $c(-\infty) = \xi$ foliate a strip in H (possibly consisting of a single geodesic).

The uniqueness result for irrational ξ follows from Theorem 7.4. The characterization in the rational case follows from Theorem 6.1 as in the case of $M = \mathbb{T}^2$. Recall that in the case $M = \mathbb{T}^2$, the map δ_F was a homeomorphism if and only if the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t was C^0-integrable (Corollary 8.8), which is a very special situation. By Theorem 6.10, this is never the case for conformally generic Finsler metrics F on $\mathbb{T}^2$. In the higher genus case, quite the opposite holds, using also Theorem 6.10.

Corollary 8.18. *If F is conformally generic, then the map*

$$\delta_F : \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, F) \to \mathrm{Gro}(H, g) \cong \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, g) \cong \mathbb{S}^1$$

is a homeomorphism.

We have the natural compactification of the Poincaré disc H as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$ by the unit circle $\mathbb{S}^1$. Corollary 8.18 can be rewritten using the horofunction compactification, see Subsection 4.2.

Corollary 8.19. *If F is conformally generic, then the embedding*

$$i_F : H \to C^0(H)/_\sim$$

extends to a homeomorphism from the closed disc $H \cup \mathbb{S}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with the Euclidean topology to the horofunction compactification $\overline{i_F(H)}$.

In Subsection 4.3 we saw that this was the case a priori only for Finsler metrics on H with no conjugate points, meaning $\mathcal{R}_- = \mathcal{M} = S_F H$.

In Subsection 8.1 we saw that the map $\delta_F : \mathcal{W}_{dir}(H, F) \to \mathbb{S}^1$ shares some features with the convexity properties of the set $B^*(F) = \{\alpha_F \leq 1/2\}$. Reading Corollary 8.18 in this light proposes the following problem.

Problem 8.20. *Given a conformally generic Finsler metric F on a closed, orientable surface M of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$, are the convexity properties of the set $B^*(F)$ the same as those of $B^*(g)$ with respect to the metric g constant curvature -1?*

In order to discuss an approach to Problem 8.20, we consider Mather theory in the higher genus case. We shall follow ideas of Massart from [Mas03]. First, observe that there are no continuous ϕ_F^t-invariant graphs in $S_F M$, so any weak KAM solution has necessarily points of non-differentiability and the Aubry sets $\mathcal{A}_{[\eta]} \subset S_F M$ with $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F)$ cannot project onto M. Instead, the projection $\pi(\mathcal{A}_{[\eta]})$ yields a geodesic lamination.

Definition 8.21. *An* F-geodesic lamination of M *is a closed subset $L \subset M$ consisting of pairwise disjoint images of F-geodesics.*

Motivated by the ideas of Massart [Mas03] we can assign to a geodesic lamination $L \subset M$ its "homological complexity".

Definition 8.22. *Let $L \subset M$ be an F-geodesic lamination. A closed, piecewise C^1 curve $c : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to M$ is an (ε, L)-curve, if the part $c(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) - L$ has total length at most ε. Then let us write*

$$V(\varepsilon, L) := \operatorname{span}\{[c] \in H_1(M, \mathbb{R}) : c \text{ is a closed } (\varepsilon, L)\text{-curve}\}$$

and consider the vector subspace

$$V(L) := \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} V(\varepsilon, L) \subset H_1(M, \mathbb{R}).$$

The homological complexity of the F-geodesic lamination L *is given by the integer*

$$\operatorname{hc}(L) := \dim V(L).$$

Note that in the definition of $V(L)$ it makes no difference if we take the F- or g-length. As an example consider the case of the 2-torus $(\mathbb{T}^2, F)$. The F-geodesic lamination L of $\mathbb{T}^2$ induced by $\mathcal{M}^{rec}(\xi)$ for ξ with irrational slope satisfies $\operatorname{hc}(L) = 2$, which follows from the results in Subsection 7.1. Of course, the same holds of $\mathcal{M}(\xi) \supset \mathcal{M}^{rec}(\xi)$. If ξ

has rational slope, then for the lamination L induced by $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi)$ with $\gamma_\xi(t) = x + t\xi$ we have $\mathrm{hc}(L) = 2$, if $\mathbb{T}^2$ is foliated by periodic minimal geodesics in the homotopy class of γ_ξ and $\mathrm{hc}(L) = 1$ otherwise. These facts are related to Theorem 8.9, as we shall see. The sets $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi) \cup (\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi) \cap \mathcal{R}^i_-(\xi))$ defined after Theorem 6.1 induce laminations L with $\mathrm{hc}(L) = 2$ as the heteroclinics can be used to span homology classes linearly independent of $[\gamma_\xi]$. This is related to the strict convexity of α_F in the endpoints $[\eta_i]$ of the segment $\mathcal{F}_\xi \subset \partial B^*(F)$.

We recall definitions from [Mas97] and [Mas03].

Definition 8.23. *A* flat of $B^*(F) = \{\alpha_F \leq 1/2\}$ *is the set* $\mathcal{F} = A \cap \partial B^*(F)$*, where* A *is an affine subspace of* $H^1(M, \mathbb{R})$ *meeting* $B^*(F)$*, but not the interior* $B^*(F) - \partial B^*(F)$*. The dimension* $\dim \mathcal{F}$ *of a flat* $\mathcal{F}$ *is the dimension* $\dim \mathrm{Aff}(\mathcal{F})$ *of the affine subspace* $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathcal{F})$ *spanned by* $\mathcal{F}$*. The interior of* $\mathcal{F}$ *is the interior of* $\mathcal{F}$ *in* $\mathrm{Aff}(\mathcal{F})$*. Given* $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F)$*, the* maximal face $\mathcal{F}_{[\eta]} \subset \partial B^*(F)$ of $[\eta]$ *is given by the maximal face (with respect to inclusion) containing* $[\eta]$ *in its interior.*

Note that, by β_F being the convex conjugate of α_F, the face $\mathcal{F}_{[\eta]}$ relates to directions of non-differentiability of β_F.

The following problem was stated as part of Theorem 1 in [Mas03]. While Massart pointed out some gaps in the erratum [Mas15], observe that our Theorem 7.3 could fix the gaps in [Mas03]. See also the arguments in the proof of Theorem 8.25.

Problem 8.24. *Let* M *be a closed orientable surface of genus* $\mathfrak{g} \geq 1$*. Is it true, that*

$$\mathrm{hc}(\pi(\mathcal{A}_{[\eta]})) = \dim H^1(M, \mathbb{R}) - \dim \mathcal{F}_{[\eta]}?$$

This means that the more homology classes the projected Aubry set spans, the more strict convexity should be seen in α_F or, equivalently, the more differentiable does β_F become. Note that by convexity of β_F there exist many points of differentiability for β_F and hence, many faces $\mathcal{F}_{[\eta]}$ are single points. In Theorem 8.4 we observed in this case a uniqueness result for weak KAM solutions for $M = \mathbb{T}^2$. Hence, one could expect that for many $[\eta]$, the η-weak KAM solution is unique. Observe also, that Problem 8.24 is related to conjectures due to Mañé in dimension two, see [Mas03].

We wish to relate the homological complexity of the Aubry sets $\mathcal{A}_{[\eta]}$ to the background metric g. For $v \in \mathcal{A}_{[\eta]}$, consider any lift $\tilde{c}_v : \mathbb{R} \to H$ of $c_v : \mathbb{R} \to M$ and let $\gamma \subset H$ be the unique g-geodesic shadowing the minimal geodesic $\tilde{c}_v$. The totality of all such g-geodesics, projected back to M yields a g-geodesic lamination

$$\Lambda(\mathcal{A}_{[\eta]}) \subset M.$$

The fact that it is a lamination follows from the corresponding property of $\mathcal{A}_{[\eta]}$. Similarly, we obtain a lamination $\Lambda(\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]}) \subset M$ from the Mather set $\mathcal{M}_{[\eta]} \subset S_F M$ and $\Lambda([u])$ from the set of $[u]$-calibrated curves with respect to an η-weak KAM solution $[u]$. More generally, let $L \subset M$ be an F-geodesic lamination consisting of minimal geodesics. Lifting each F-geodesic in L to H, we can associate to it a unique g-geodesic in finite distance. The totality of such g-geodesics in M defines a g-geodesic lamination $\Lambda(L)$. Note that the structure of g-geodesic laminations is studied e.g. in [BC88].

The following theorem points to an affirmative solution to Problem 8.20 via the formula in Problem 8.24.

Theorem 8.25. *If $L \subset M$ is an F-geodesic lamination consisting entirely of non-closed of minimal geodesics, then the homological complexity satisfies*

$$\mathrm{hc}(L) = \mathrm{hc}(\Lambda(L)).$$

Sketch of the proof of Theorem 8.25. (see Figure 7) We abbreviate $\Lambda = \Lambda(L)$. Each g-geodesic γ in Λ is the image of an F-minimal geodesic c_γ in L under the correspondence $L \mapsto \Lambda(L)$ (c_γ need not be unique). Imagine an isotopy $\{\psi_t\}_{t\in[0,1]}$ of M taking each γ in Λ into c_γ in L, not worrying about the existence in this sketch. By Lemma 4.4 in [BC88], each component U of $M - \Lambda$ is either a finite-sided, ideal polygon with geodesic boundary or consists of a compact subsurface $M_0 \subset M$ with finitely many boundary components consisting of closed geodesics, attaching to each boundary geodesic a "crown". Here we use that there are no closed geodesics in L and as L is closed, there are no closed geodesics in Λ. In any case, each boundary component of U consists of a finite, cyclic family of successively asymptotic g-geodesics in Λ. Let α be an (ε, Λ)-curve. Any subsegment α_0 of α contained in the closure of a component $U \subset M - \Lambda$ has to lie ε-close to a cyclic boundary part of U and for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ it has to be disjoint from the other boundary parts. Under the isotopy $\{\psi_t\}$, the segment α_0 becomes a segment $\psi_1(\alpha_0)$ connecting two points in the image under ψ_1 of the cyclic boundary of U, lying on geodesics of the form $c_\gamma = \psi_1(\gamma)$. By Theorem 7.3, successive geodesics in the cyclic boundary part of $\psi_1(U)$ come arbitrarily close to each other in the ends and we push $\psi_1(\alpha_0)$ further into the ends (using parts of L) obtaing a segment a_0, so that $a_0 - L$ has length at most that of $\alpha_0 - \Lambda$. This shows that any (ε, Λ)-curve α is homotopic to an (ε, L)-curve a, if $\varepsilon \ll 1$. By the same arguments one shows that any (ε, L)-curve is homotopic to an (ε, Λ)-curve for small ε. The claim follows. □



FIGURE 7. The "crown" as part of the component U with the curve segment α_0 and a_0 in $\pi_1(U)$.

Observe that we used Theorem 7.3 in order to prove Theorem 8.25, applied to *simple* geodesics. While Theorem 7.3 has a rather complicated proof in general, the case of simple geodesics is much easier, see Lemma 2.14 in [Sch15d] and Proposition 3.16 in [Sch15a]. We also expect in this case, that it is not hard to prove that lim inf can be replaced by lim in Theorem 7.3.

We expect (a version of) Theorem 8.25 to be true without the assumption that the geodesics in L are not closed, but this assumption simplifies the proof. For the general case involving closed geodesics, one might want to assume that F is conformally generic is in order to have $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$ consist of a single minimal geodesic for periodic g-geodesics γ (Theorem 6.10). This shows that F-geodesics with rational asymptotic directions are asymptotic (Theorem 6.1). Without the genericity assumption, the number $\mathrm{hc}(L)$ might a priori decrease if there exists an embedded annulus $A \subset M$ bounded by pair of homotopic, periodic F-geodesics in L and if in the lamination of A by L not every gap is bridged by a heteroclinic contained in L.

Theorem 8.25 in connection with Problems 8.20 and 8.24 motivates the following question.

Problem 8.26. *Given $[\eta] \in \partial B^*(F)$, does there exist $[\eta_0] \in \partial B^*(g)$ with*

$$\Lambda(\pi(\mathcal{A}^F_{[\eta]})) = \pi(\mathcal{A}^g_{[\eta_0]})$$

and vice versa, writing $\mathcal{A}^F_{[\eta]}$ for the Aubry set with respect to F?

We have related the structure of laminations by F-minimal geodesics to the background metric g. Recall that in Subsection 5.2 we defined the Mather set $\mathcal{M}^h$ of a homology class $h \in H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$. Note that $H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})$ lies naturally in $H_1(M, \mathbb{R})$. Theorem 8.25 applies in particular to projected Mather sets $\pi(\mathcal{M}^h) \subset M$. If h is completely irrational,

then $\mathrm{hc}(\pi(\mathcal{M}^h))$ can be linked to g-geodesic laminations. Let us in this connection state the following result of Mather sets $\mathcal{M}^h$ with h being rational, generalizing Theorem 8.5, see [CMP04].

Theorem 8.27. *If for $h \in \partial B(F)$ there exists $a > 0$ with $ah \in H_1(M, \mathbb{Z})$, then $\mathcal{M}^h$ consists of periodic minimal geodesics.*

9. Topological entropy

In this section, let M be a closed, orientable surface. We saw that minimal geodesics lie at the heart of integrable behavior in geodesic flows. In this section, we study a number expressing the dynamical complexity of the geodesic flows, namely the topological entropy $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F M)$. Let us refer to [KH95] for the definition and more information on the topological entropy $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi^t, X) = h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi^1, X) \in [0, +\infty]$ of a dynamical system $\phi^t : X \to X$ ($t \in \mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{R}$) in a compact metrizable space X. It measures the growth of distinguishable orbits on an exponential scale. By a result of Katok (Corollary 4.3 in [Kat80]), $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi^t, X) > 0$ is in low dimensional systems ($\dim X = 2, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ or $\dim X = 3, t \in \mathbb{R}$) equivalent to the existence of non-trivial, hyperbolic invariant sets (horse-shoes) and the existence of transverse intersections of stable and unstable manifolds. On the other hand, if $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi^t, X) = 0$, one might expect a rather ordered behavior of ϕ^t – the smaller $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi^t, X)$, the more integrable behavior there can be, in particular for the set of minimal geodesics, if $\phi^t = \phi_F^t$ and $X = S_F M$. This is indeed the case, as we shall see. Moreover, the structure in the set of minimal geodesics can be applied to study the overall geodesic flow.

9.1. **The entropy of minimal geodesics.** We saw that minimal F-geodesics behave in much the same way as g-geodesics. Hence, one expects that the topological entropy $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, Dp(\mathcal{M}))$ of the restricted geodesic flow $\phi_F^t|_{Dp(\mathcal{M})}$ resembles that of ϕ_g^t in $S_g M$. In [Man79], Manning introduced the volume entropy (also called volume growth) $h(F)$ of (H, F) defined by

$$h(F) := \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{1}{r} \log \mathrm{vol}_g B_F(x, r),$$

where $x \in H$ and $B_F(x, r)$ denotes the (forward) open d_F-ball with center x and radius r. Note that, if a Riemannian metric g' is equivalent to g, then we can measure $h(F)$ both in g and g' with the same resulting number. Hence, g does not appear in the notation $h(F)$. We have in general the following relation.

Theorem 9.1 (Theorem 9.6.7 in [KH95])**.**

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, Dp(\mathcal{M})) \geq h(F).$$

Note that this theorem holds in any dimension. In the case of non-positive curvature equality holds. Subsequently this was generalized by Freire and Mañé [FM82] to metrics without conjugate points, i.e. the case where $Dp(\mathcal{M}) = S_F M$.

The following problem was posed by Knieper.

Problem 9.2. *If (M, g) is a closed hyperbolic manifold and F an arbitrary Finsler metric on M, does the equality $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, Dp(\mathcal{M})) = h(F)$ hold? Is it true that $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, \mathcal{M}(\gamma)) = 0$ for all g-geodesics γ in H?*

It is shown in [GKOS14], that an affirmative answer to the second question entails an affirmative answer to the first one. In the case $\dim M = 2$, we proved in [GKOS14] the following.

Theorem 9.3. *If M is a closed surface and F is a Finsler metric on M, then*

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, Dp(\mathcal{M})) = h(F).$$

Using Theorems 6.1, 7.1 (iv) and 7.4 and the techniques in [GKOS14] one can prove the following strengthening of Theorem 9.3.

Theorem 9.4. *If M is a closed surface of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 1$ and F is a Finsler metric on M, then for all g-geodesics $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to H$ we have*

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, \mathcal{M}(\gamma)) = 0.$$

Hence, the entropy of minimal geodesics in dimension two resembles properties in constant curvature. In particular, for $M = \mathbb{T}^2$, the entropy $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, Dp(\mathcal{M}))$ vanishes, as the volume of balls $B(x, r)$ grows only quadratically.

9.2. **Geodesic flows with vanishing entropy.** By a result of Dinaburg (Corollary 4.2 in [Din71]) we find

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F M) > 0,$$

if the genus of M is $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$ (this also follows from Theorem 9.3). In this subsection we shall assume that M is either the 2-sphere $M = \mathbb{S}^2$ or the 2-torus $M = \mathbb{T}^2$. Both surfaces admit whole families of completely integrable geodesic flows [BF04]. Due to a result of Paternain [Pat91], these completely integrable Hamiltonian systems have vanishing topological entropy. Hence, on $M = \mathbb{S}^2, \mathbb{T}^2$ there exists a variety of examples of Finsler metrics F with

$$h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F M) = 0.$$

A natural question is, whether the converse is true, i.e. does the vanishing of the entropy of ϕ_F^t in S_FM entail some form of integrability?

For integrable geodesic flows, the closure of orbits stays small. We propose the following more general definition.

Definition 9.5. *A dynamical system $\phi^t : X \to X$ $(t \in T)$ in a topological space X is* weakly integrable*, if for all $x \in X$, the orbit $\mathcal{O}(x, \phi^t) = \{\phi^t x : t \in T\}$ is nowhere dense in X.*

One might ask, whether $h_{\text{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_FM) = 0$ implies at least weak integrability. This is not the case. We write μ_F for the Liouville measure in S_FM (the pullback of the canonical measure in the symplectic manifold T^*M under the Legendre transform associated to $\frac{1}{2}F^2$, restricted to S_FM, which is a smooth measure invariant under ϕ_F^t).

Theorem 9.6 (Katok [Kat73])**.** *There exist reversible Finsler metrics F on $\mathbb{S}^2$, arbitrarily C^k-close to the standard round metric for fixed $2 \leq k < \infty$, whose geodesic flow has vanishing topological entropy $h_{\text{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{S}^2) = 0$ and which admits two closed, ϕ_F^t-invariant sets $A_0, A_1 \subset S_F\mathbb{S}^2$, such that $A_1 = \{-v : v \in A_0\}$, $\phi_F^t|_{A_i}$ is ergodic and such that the measure $\mu_F(S_F\mathbb{S}^2 - (A_0 \cup A_1))$ is positive but arbitrarily small. In particular, $\phi_F^t|_{A_i}$ is transitive.*

Dropping the reversibility assumption $F(-v) = F(v)$ on F, Katok [Kat73] was able to construct similar examples, where ϕ_F^t is ergodic in the whole unit tangent bundle $S_F\mathbb{S}^2$ (in this example ϕ_F^t has only two closed orbits). One question is, whether Theorem 9.6 is optimal in the sense that transitivity or ergodicity can be obtained in the whole unit tangent bundle in the reversible case. We proved the following theorem in [Sch15c].

Theorem 9.7 ([Sch15c])**.** *Let F be a reversible Finsler metric on $\mathbb{S}^2$, such that every closed F-geodesic has a pair of conjugate points along itself. If the geodesic flow $\phi_F^t : S_F\mathbb{S}^2 \to S_F\mathbb{S}^2$ is transitive, i.e. if there exists a dense orbit in $S_F\mathbb{S}^2$, then*

$$h_{\text{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{S}^2) > 0.$$

Hence, under the condition on conjugate points (which is fulfilled, e.g., if F has positive flag curvatures), dense geodesics and in particular ergodicity of the geodesic flow in $S_F\mathbb{S}^2$ imply the existence of a non-trivial, hyperbolic invariant set for ϕ_F^t, cf. Corollary 4.3 in [Kat80]. Assuming conversely, that the topological entropy vanishes there will be a certain amount of structure in the dynamics of ϕ_F^t: orbits cannot become as large as $S_F\mathbb{S}^2$.

We can ask the following questions.

Problem 9.8. *Does transitivity of the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t in $S_F\mathbb{S}^2$ of a general reversible Finsler metric F on $\mathbb{S}^2$ imply $h_{\text{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{S}^2) > 0$? Dropping the reversibility assumption, does transitivity together with at least three distinct closed orbits of ϕ_F^t imply $h_{\text{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{S}^2) > 0$?*

Problem 9.9. *Do there exist Riemannian metrics g on $\mathbb{S}^2$ with everywhere strictly positive curvature, whose geodesic flow ϕ_g^t is ergodic in $S_g\mathbb{S}^2$?*

Problem 9.8 was posed by G. Knieper. Our result answers the question affirmatively in the presence of conjugate points, in particular in the case of positive curvature. The general case is a topic for future research. Problem 9.9 is a long-standing open problem. For instance, by the results of V. J. Donnay [Don88] there exist Riemannian metrics on $\mathbb{S}^2$, whose geodesic flow is ergodic in $S_F\mathbb{S}^2$; however, for these metrics there exist large regions of negative curvature and it is the negative curvature that creates ergodicity by means of hyperbolicity. Our result shows that ergodicity and positive curvature would necessarily entail hyperbolicity in the geodesic flow by means of topological entropy.

Let us move to $M = \mathbb{T}^2$. Recall that g-geodesics are straight lines. We shall write $\gamma_\xi(t) = \xi t$. The assumption $h_{\text{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{T}^2) = 0$ leads to strong integrable behavior on a large scale. Intuitively, $h_{\text{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{T}^2) = 0$ prevents the transverse intersection of (un)stable manifolds by the result of Katok mentioned earlier, while the gap-condition in Subsection 6.2 generalizes such a transverse intersection. The following theorem (proved in [Sch15b]) follows easily from Theorem 6.3, using the oscillating local minimizers to generate entropy. Observe that by Theorem 9.4, one cannot use minimal geodesics, i.e. global minimizers in $\mathbb{T}^2$ to generate entropy. A version of the following theorem for reversible Finsler metrics is due to Glasmachers and Knieper [GK10], [GK11], for monotone twist maps it was given by Angenent [Ang92].

Theorem 9.10. *Let F be a Finsler metric on $\mathbb{T}^2$ with $h_{\text{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{T}^2) = 0$. Then for all $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ the sets $Dp(\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi))$ project onto $\mathbb{T}^2$ and consist of one or two continuous, ϕ_F^t-invariant graphs (always one if ξ is irrational, two if ξ is rational and $\mathcal{M}^{per}(\gamma_\xi) \neq \mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi)$).*

Equivalently, the boundary elements $[u_0], [u_1]$ of $\delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$ are C^1, see Proposition 4.15. For irrational ξ, the unique element $[u] \in \delta_F^{-1}(\xi)$ is C^1. See Figure 8 for invariant sets in Theorem 9.10.

Remark 9.11 (Polynomial entropy)**.** Another notion of entropy is polynomial or slow entropy, measuring not the exponential growth rate



FIGURE 8. The invariant graphs and flow lines of ϕ_F^t in the unit tangent bundle $S_F\mathbb{T}^2 \cong \mathbb{T}^3$ occurring in Theorem 9.10 in the case of $h_{\text{top}}(\phi_F^t) = 0$. The horizontal plane can be thought of as the base $\mathbb{T}^2$. Compare this to the case of the rotational torus or the simple pendulum. One can see an elliptic tube E containing a ϕ_F^t-invariant sub-tube A, where $\phi_F^t|_A$ might be ergodic due to Theorem 9.14.

of orbits, but the polynomial one. While for topological entropy transverse intersections of (un)stable manifolds trigger entropy, for the slow entropy one way to generate entropy is by heteroclinic connections. In this way, Bernard and Labrousse [BL14] were able to characterize the flat torus by minimizing the slow entropy: a metric minimizing the slow entropy cannot have heteroclinics. See also Corollary 8.8. One could also study the links between slow entropy and the set $B(F) = \{\sigma_F \leq 1\}$. Note also [BI95] relating the stable norm to volume asymptotics, which are in turn related to entropy by Subsection 9.1.

What remains open in Theorem 9.10 is a description of the dynamics of ϕ_F^t in the complement of $Dp(\mathcal{M})$. The following terminology is motivated by the often found presence of elliptic closed geodesics there, see also the example in Subsection 2.1.

Definition 9.12. *Let F be a Finsler metric on $\mathbb{T}^2$ with vanishing entropy $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{T}^2) = 0$. An* elliptic tube *is a connected component E of $S_F\mathbb{T}^2 - Dp(\mathcal{M})$.*

Remark 9.13. Note that an elliptic tube is surrounded by a single set $\mathcal{M}(\gamma_\xi)$ for some rational direction ξ. Notably, in the Riemannian case the only known examples of geodesic flows with $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{T}^2) = 0$ arise from Liouville metrics of the form

$$g_{(x_1,x_2)}(v,w) = (f(x_1) + g(x_2)) \cdot \langle\, v, w \,\rangle_{euc},$$

which have elliptic tubes only in the directions $-e_1, e_1, -e_2, e_2$. Liouville metrics are a simple generalization of rotational metrics discussed in Subsection 2.1. In the Finsler case, Theorem 9.14 below yields more examples in the Finsler setting. In a different direction, one could use monotone twist maps with many Mather sets of rational homology, that are not invariant curves; cf. the proof of Theorem 3.3 in [Neu77]. We show in Subsection 11.1 how such examples yield examples of reversible Finsler metrics on $\mathbb{T}^2$ with integrable geodesic flows, which have elliptic tubes of several directions. Hence, there exist in the Finsler setting many examples of integrable geodesic flows other than Liouville metrics.

Our next theorem shows that, even if $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{T}^2) = 0$, elliptic tubes can contain complicated dynamical behavior of ϕ_F^t. For the proof we apply Katok's construction, which also led to the examples in Theorem 9.6, to a particular rotational metric on $\mathbb{T}^2$.

Theorem 9.14 ([Sch15c])**.** *There exist reversible Finsler metrics F on $\mathbb{T}^2$ with vanishing topological entropy $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{T}^2) = 0$ and an elliptic tube $E \subset S_F\mathbb{T}^2$ containing a ϕ_F^t-invariant, closed sub-tube $A \subset E$ with non-empty interior, such that $\phi_F^t|_A$ is ergodic, hence transitive. The measure $\mu_F(E - A)$ is positive, but can be made arbitrarily small.*

In the spirit of Theorem 9.7, our next theorem shows that complicated behavior in all of E is excluded.

Theorem 9.15 ([Sch15c])**.** *Let F be a reversible Finsler metric on $\mathbb{T}^2$ with vanishing topological entropy $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi_F^t, S_F\mathbb{T}^2) = 0$ and suppose that $E \subset S_F\mathbb{T}^2$ is an elliptic tube for ϕ_F^t. Then the set*

$$\left\{ v \in E : \overline{\{\phi_F^t v : t \in \mathbb{R}\}} \cap \partial E \neq \emptyset \right\}$$

is nowhere dense in E. In particular, $\phi_F^t|_E$ cannot be transitive, hence not ergodic.

Recall that a nowhere dense set is a set whose closure has empty interior. In particular, the complement of a nowhere dense set contains an open and dense set. Hence, Theorem 9.15 shows that topologically almost every ϕ_F^t-orbit in E is bounded away from the boundary ∂E of the elliptic tube. This indicates that there are large, closed, ϕ_F^t-invariant sets in the interior of E, not touching the boundary ∂E. A possible picture would be a sequence $\{A_n\}$ of nested, invariant, closed tubes inside the elliptic tube E, such that $E = \cup A_n$. However, the sets

$$A_n := \left\{ v \in E : \inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} d(\partial E, \phi_F^t v) \geq 1/n \right\}$$

might a priori be quite exotic and Theorem 9.15 guarantees that $\cup A_n$ equals E only up to a topologically small set.

Both Theorems 9.7 and 9.15 rely on the construction of a Poincaré section $N \subset S_F M$, which can be used to describe (more or less) the whole geodesic flow. This reduces $\phi_F^t : S_F M \to S_F M$ to a diffeomorphism ϕ of a surface N, which we study in Subsection 9.3 below.

9.3. **Zero-entropy surface diffeomorphisms.** We work in the setting of [FH12]. Let μ be a measure on the 2-sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$ topologically conjugate to the Lebesgue measure (i.e. there exists a homeomorphism of $\mathbb{S}^2$ conjugating μ to the Lebesgue measure). Let N be a surface diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{S}^2$ with $n \geq 0$ disjoint, smoothly bounded, open discs removed. Collapsing each boundary circle $\partial_i N$ of N into a point $p_i \in \mathbb{S}^2$ defines a C^0-quotient map $\pi_N : N \to \mathbb{S}^2$, whose restriction $\operatorname{Int} N \to \mathbb{S}^2 - P$ is a C^∞-diffeomorphism, where $P = \{p_1, ..., p_n\}$. If $\phi : N \to N$ is an orientation-preserving C^∞-diffeomorphism, leaving each boundary component $\partial_i N$ invariant, we can define a homeomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \to \mathbb{S}^2$ by $\psi \circ \pi_N = \pi_N \circ \phi$, such that $P \subset \operatorname{Fix}(\psi)$. We denote by

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{S}^2, P, \mu) \subset \operatorname{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{S}^2)$$

the set of all so obtained homeomorphisms $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \to \mathbb{S}^2$, that in addition preserve the measure μ and have vanishing topological entropy

$$h_{\text{top}}(\psi, \mathbb{S}^2) = 0.$$

The above setting applies to geodesic flows on surfaces with vanishing entropy, cf. Subsection 9.2.

We reformulate of parts of Theorem 1.2 from [FH12].

Theorem 9.16 (Franks, Handel)**.** *Let $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ and consider the set $\mathcal{A}$ of maximal, ψ-invariant, open annuli $U \subset \mathbb{S}^2 - \operatorname{Fix}(\psi)$. Then the elements of $\mathcal{A}$ are pairwise disjoint and the union $\bigcup_{U\in\mathcal{A}} U$ is (open and) dense in $\mathbb{S}^2 - \operatorname{Fix}(\psi)$.*

Franks and Handel prove more on the dynamics of ψ in the annuli $U \in \mathcal{A}$. For instance, each restriction $\psi|_U$ has a continuous integral of motion given by the rotation number. Using these results, we were in [Sch15c] able to prove Theorems 9.7 and 9.15.

Recall the Definition 9.5 of weak integrability. We already saw that $h_{\text{top}}(\psi, \mathbb{S}^2) = 0$ does not imply weak integrability, but one can ask under what conditions can the closure of an orbit contain an open set.

Problem 9.17. *If $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ and $x \in \mathbb{S}^2$, such that the interior*

$$\operatorname{Int} \overline{\mathcal{O}_\psi(x)} \neq \emptyset,$$

does there exists $q \geq 1$ and a ψ^q-invariant, open annulus

$$U \subset \mathbb{S}^2 - \operatorname{Per}(\psi)$$

with $x \in U$?

Note that if the annulus $U \subset \mathbb{S}^2 - \operatorname{Per}(\psi)$, then in particular, $\psi^q|_U$ is an irrational pseudo-rotation. Bramham [Bra15] proves for the closed disc, that an irrational pseudo-rotation can be approximated by a sequence of integrable maps ψ_n. If the answer to Problem 9.17 is affirmative and if one could extend the main result of [Bra15] to $\psi^q : U \to U$ (one can use that ψ comes from a diffeomorphism of a compact surface in order to control the system), then the whole system $\psi : \mathbb{S}^2 \to \mathbb{S}^2$ would be weakly integrable in some set (the complement of open annuli, where ψ is a pseudo-rotation) and approximated by properly integrable ones in the complement. This would be a step towards answering an old question of Katok.

Problem 9.18 (Katok)**.** *Is every element $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ a limit in some sense of integrable $\psi_n \in \mathcal{H}$?*

We give some ideas as to Problem 9.17, but not having checked most of the details. Note in this connection also Theorem 3.2 and its proof in [Sch15c].

Ideas for the proof of Problem 9.17. For $q \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\mathcal{A}(q)$ be the set of maximal, open, ψ^q-invariant annuli in $\mathbb{S}^2 - \operatorname{Fix}(\psi^q)$ as in [FH12]. For $U \in \mathcal{A}(q)$, the rotation number $\rho_{\psi^q, U} : U \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is defined everywhere, continuous and ψ^q-invariant. Consider the set

$$X := \bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{A}(q)} \bigcup_{r \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \text{ irrat.}} \operatorname{Int} \rho^{-1}_{\psi^q, U}(r).$$

Note that X is a union of open annuli contained in $\mathbb{S}^2 - \operatorname{Per}(\psi)$ (use Theorem 1.4 (3) in [FH12] to show that each component is either an

annulus or an open disc; indeed, any non-contractible loop in a component of X has to be essential in the corresponding annulus; open discs are ψ^{kq}-invariant for some $k \geq 1$ by recurrence and μ being positive on open sets and hence contain periodic points by Brouwer's theorem, contradicting the irrationality of r; open annuli have to be ψ^q-invariant by Theorem 1.4 (3) in [FH12]) and X as a set is ψ-invariant (the components of X can be permuted).

We have to show that any point $x \in \mathbb{S}^2$ with $\operatorname{Int} \overline{\mathcal{O}_\psi(x)} \neq \emptyset$ lies in X. For this, suppose the contrary. By Theorem 1.2 (3) in [FH12] and Baire's category theorem, one can probably show that any point x with $\operatorname{Int} \overline{\mathcal{O}_\psi(x)} \neq \emptyset$ has to belong to $\cup_{U \in \mathcal{A}(q)} U$ for all q (note that the ω-limit sets belong to the *frontier* of the fixed point sets and cannot enter the interior of the fixed point set; hence the ω-limit sets cannot have interior...). It then remains to show that x has irrational rotation number in some $U \in \mathcal{A}(q)$, for some q. For this, one could use the techniques in the proofs of Theorems 3.2 and 1.2 in [Sch15c]: the rationality of the rotation number generates periodic points, which lead to smaller invariant annuli containing the orbit of x.

Another possible approach is to directly consider the components A of the set $\operatorname{Int} \overline{\mathcal{O}_\psi(x)} \neq \emptyset$. By recurrence and $\mu(A) > 0$, we find $q \geq 1$ with $\psi^q(A) = A$ and $\operatorname{Int} \overline{\mathcal{O}_\psi(x)} = \cup_{i=0}^{q-1} \psi^i(A)$. If A is simply connected, then A is either the whole $\mathbb{S}^2$ or an open disc. In the first case, note that $\psi^q \in \operatorname{Homeo}_+(\mathbb{S}^2)$ has at least two disjoint fixed points x_0, x_1 (Theorem 3.10 in [Bon06] plus Brouwer's fixed point theorem); here we set $U = A - \{p_0, p_1\}$. In the second case, we find a fixed point $x_0 \in A$ of ψ^q and set $U = A - \{x_0\}$. If A is an annulus, there is nothing to prove. If A has ≥ 3 holes, then one can possibly use the invariant annuli of [FH12] to further decompose the set A (in each disc-like hole, one could expect to find periodic points, such that boundaries of invariant annuli have to cut through A, while by assumption $\psi|_A$ is transitive). More precisely: use Theorem (3.4) in [Fra92] to obtain periodic points in A (the rotation number of some iterate ψ^q should vanish identically). □

10. Miscellaneous results

10.1. **Invariant graphs and contractible geodesic loops.** A classical theorem of Birkhoff states that in a region of instability of a monotone twist map of an annulus, one can connect the boundaries of that region by an orbit of the twist map. There is a well-known relationship between monotone twist maps and geodesic flows on $\mathbb{T}^2$, see Section 11.1 below. One of the main differences is (informally) that

geodesics in $\mathbb{T}^2$ might be recurrent in the universal cover $\mathbb{R}^2$. Translated to geodesic flows on $\mathbb{T}^2$, we propose the following version of Birkhoff's theorem and will sketch a proof for reversible Finsler metrics.

Problem 10.1. *Let F be a Finsler metric on $\mathbb{T}^2$, such that there are no continuous ϕ_F^t-invariant graphs in $S_F\mathbb{T}^2$. Does there exist a simple closed F-geodesic in the universal cover $\mathbb{R}^2$?*

Conversely, if $c : \mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is a simple closed F-geodesic, then the velocity curve $\dot{c} : \mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z} \to S_F\mathbb{R}^2$ lies in one of the prime, non-trivial homotopy classes of $S_F\mathbb{R}^2 \cong \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$ (this is known as the Umlaufsatz due to Hopf). In particular, the image $\dot{c}(\mathbb{R}/T\mathbb{Z})$ intersects any C^0-graph in $S_F\mathbb{R}^2$, so that there cannot be a continuous ϕ_F^t-invariant graph in $S_F\mathbb{R}^2$, in particular not in $S_F\mathbb{T}^2$.

Hence, if the answer to Problem 10.1 is affirmative, then the non-existence of invariant C^0-graphs for the geodesic flow $\phi_F^t : S_F\mathbb{T}^2 \to S_F\mathbb{T}^2$ and the existence of simple closed F-geodesics in $\mathbb{R}^2$ would be equivalent. Recall that an invariant C^0-graph in $S_F\mathbb{T}^2$ has to be Lipschitz (a classical result due to Birkhoff, see e.g. the appendix in [Mat91a]) and by the arguments in Section 4 one can show that it has to be contained in some set $\mathcal{M}(\gamma)$. In particular, an invariant C^0-graph would entail $\pi(\mathcal{M}(\gamma)) = \mathbb{R}^2$ for some g-geodesic γ.

An intuitive situation with a contractible, simple closed geodesic $c : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{T}^2$ is given in Proposition 9.7 in [Ban88]: A large bump in $\mathbb{T}^2$ induces a simple closed geodesic encircling the bump.

Let us sketch a proof for an affirmative answer to Problem 10.1, under the assumption that F is reversible. The first step is the following lemma resembling Birkhoff's result mentioned earlier. It is proved in the setting of monotone twist maps in [Mat91a] (see in particular p. 257), working with a variational principle related to the (symmetric) distance d_F in $\mathbb{R}^2$ via the ideas in [Ban88], see also Subsection 11.1. Hence, it is believable that the lemma holds in the setting of $(\mathbb{T}^2, F)$.

Lemma 10.2. *Let F be a reversible Finsler metric on $\mathbb{T}^2$ and let $I \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ be an interval not containing antipodal points. Assume that $\pi(\mathcal{M}(\gamma)) \neq \mathbb{R}^2$ for all Euclidean straight lines γ with direction $\gamma(\infty) = \xi \in I$. Then for any pair ξ_-, ξ_+ of irrational points in I there exists an F-geodesic $c : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ with $c(t)$ tending to infinity as $|t| \to \infty$, with $c(\mathbb{R}_-)$ in finite distance of $\mathbb{R}_-\xi_-$ and $c(\mathbb{R}_+)$ in finite distance of $\mathbb{R}_+\xi_+$.*

The assumption that the points ξ_-, ξ_+ are not antipodal makes it easier to adapt the techniques from [Mat91a], while this assumption should not be necessary. Let us now assume that there are no invariant C^0-graphs in $S_F\mathbb{T}^2$. Lemma 10.2 applies to any non-antipodal pair



FIGURE 9. The curves c_1, c_2, c_2 in $\mathbb{R}^2$ given by Lemma 10.2, the domain A and the curve $c_0 = c$.

ξ_-, ξ_+, so that we are able to construct three geodesics c_1, c_2, c_3 as in Figure 9. As seen in Figure 9, one obtains a closed domain $A \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, whose boundary ∂A consists of parts of the c_i and has three vertices of outer angles $< \pi$. Take now a smooth, simple closed curve $c : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}^2 - A$ and apply the curve shortening flow. The curve-shortening flow is discussed in [Gra89] and has been extended to the reversible Finsler case in [Ang08]. We obtain a variation $c_t : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}^2$ of $c = c_0$ for $t \in [0, \infty)$. No curve c_t can intersect the set A, as the complement $\mathbb{R}^2 - A \supset c_0(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})$ is locally convex. In particular, c_t cannot shrink to a point. It is a property of the curve shortening flow that then the limit $c_\infty = \lim_{t\to\infty} c_t$ has to be a simple closed F-geodesic in $\mathbb{R}^2 - A$. The claim follows.

Possibly, the result has an analogon for higher genus surfaces. Here, one cannot expect invariant graphs in $S_F M$, but in the universal cover we have the candidates $\mathcal{R}_-(\xi) \subset S_F H$. Gaps in the projections

$$\pi(\mathcal{R}_-(\xi)) \subset H$$

could be used to construct a geodesic $c : \mathbb{R} \to H$ with a self-intersection. The techniques in [Gla07], (Section 3 of) [GK10] and [GK11] yield a simple closed geodesic in H by the same ideas as above.

10.2. **Surfaces of non-positive curvature.** Recall the flat strip theorem in Subsection 2.5. An application of Theorem 7.3 yields the following.

Corollary 10.3. *If $M = H/\Gamma$ is a closed, orientable surface of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$ and F is Riemannian with non-positive curvature, then flat strips $S \subset H$ are periodic, i.e. S is invariant under some $\tau \in \Gamma - \{\mathrm{id}\}$ and foliated by τ-periodic F-geodesics.*

This result was obtained earlier by Coudene and Schapira [CS14]. It is related to the following, long-standing open problem.

Problem 10.4. *If $M = H/\Gamma$ is a closed, orientable surface of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$ and F is Riemannian with non-positive curvature, is the geodesic flow $\phi_F^t : S_F M \to S_F M$ ergodic with respect to the Liouville measure?*

It was proposed to the author by Knieper to use the ideas from [Sch15d] leading to Theorem 7.3 in order to show that for any orthogonal Jacobi field J along a non-periodic geodesic we have

$$\liminf_{t\to\infty} \|J(t)\| = 0.$$

This would be a key step to prove the ergodicity in Problem 10.4. In this connection, one can prove the following theorem. It is a generalization (and correction) of Lemma 3.7 in [Wu13]. The proof below was explained to the author by Knieper.

Theorem 10.5. *Let M be a closed orientable surface of genus $\mathfrak{g} \geq 2$ and let F be Riemannian with non-positive curvature $K_F \leq 0$. Consider the set*

$$A := \{v \in S_F M : K_F \circ c_v \equiv 0 \ \&\ c_v \text{ not periodic}\}.$$

Then A is closed.

It would be desirable to know whether A has zero Liouville measure.

Proof. We work in H, writing $\tilde{A} = Dp^{-1}(A)$. Consider $v_n \to v$ with $v_n \in \tilde{A}$. It follows that $K_F \circ c_v \equiv 0$, so we have to show that c_v is not periodic. Suppose c_v is periodic. As $c_{v_n} \neq c_v$, we find $x_n, y_n \in c_v(\mathbb{R})$, such that both x_n, y_n have distance to c_{v_n} at most 1, while we assume

$$d_g(x_n, c_{v_n}(\mathbb{R})) \to 0, \qquad d_g(y_n, c_{v_n}(\mathbb{R})) = 1.$$

Such points x_n, y_n exist by the assumed convergence, and moreover we have $d_g(x_n, y_n) \to \infty$. W.l.o.g., c_v is chosen in its homotopy class such that on the side of c_v where c_{v_n} passes y_n in distance 1, there are no more periodic geodesics with the same homotopy class as c_v (here one uses that c_{v_n} approximate every closed geodesic in the homotopy class of c_v, if c_v is part of a flat strip). We can use the translation along the periodic c_v to transport y_n into a compact set and obtain from c_{v_n} in the limit a geodesic c asymptotic to c_v with $K_F \circ c \equiv 0$.

We now argue that there cannot be a pair of asympotic geodesics c, c' in the universal cover of M, such that $K_F \circ c = K_F \circ c' = 0$ and such that c is invariant under some deck transformation τ. Suppose w.l.o.g., that $\tau c'$ lies between c, c' and let α be a geodesic segment connecting c to c'. Then the area of the ideal triangle Δ bounded by $c', \tau c'$ and α is bounded: Δ is the disjoint union of its parts D_k between $\tau^{-k-1}\alpha$ and $\tau^{-k}\alpha$ for $k \geq 0$. Under τ^k, the D_k are moved into disjoint subsets

of the compact set bounded by c, c', α and $\tau^{-1}\alpha$. But the main result in [Rug97] states that by $K_F \circ c' = 0$, the triangle Δ has infinite area. This is a contradiction. □

The main ingredients in the above proof are

(1) a certain "simplicity" of the limit geodesics (given by periodicity),
(2) the main result in [Rug97], which holds for arbitrary ideal triangles.

Possibly, one can replace the periodicity in the above proof by other properties of the limit geodesic and argue that the set A is in fact empty. For instance, recall that a set of geodesics A_0 is called simple, if the geodesics in A_0 do not intersect in the closed surface M. If the set A in the above theorem contains a simple closed subset, then we would again reach a contradiction, as we could project the obtained ideal triangles to M, where the total area is bounded.

11. Dynamical systems related to geodesic flows

Geodesic flows, especially in the Riemannian case have been studied for a long time. In this section, we discuss three dynamical systems, which are related to Finsler geodesic flows.

11.1. **Monotone twist maps.** Let us write $C = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{R}$ for the infinite cylinder. Monotone twist maps $f : C \to C$ we studied first by Poincaré , later by Birkhoff. In the 1980ies the topic became more present again through the development of Aubry-Mather theory. A monotone twist map is a diffeomorphism that leaves invariant both ends of C, preserves the standard area and orientation of C and a lift the the universal cover $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ maps vertical lines $\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}$ to graphs over the first component $\mathbb{R}$. An introduction to the topic is given e.g. in [Gol01].

Given a monotone twist map f of the cylinder C, one can find a Lagrangian $L : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times C \to \mathbb{R}$, strongly convex in the $\mathbb{R}$-component of C, so that the time one map of the Euler-Lagrange flow is $f = \phi^1_L|_{\{0\}\times C}$. See [Mos86]. The Lagrangian L defines an action $A_L(c) = \int L(t, c, \dot{c})dt$ of curves $c : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. It is shown in Appendix A of [Sch13] how to define a reversible Finsler metric F on $\mathbb{T}^2$, so that the curves (t, c) are F-geodesics, where c is a critical curve for A_L. In this sense, monotone twist maps are a special case of Finsler geodesic flows on $\mathbb{T}^2$.

Conversely, if F is a Finsler metric on $\mathbb{T}^2$ and $L : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times C \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by $L(x, r) := F(x, 1, r)$, where $x \in \mathbb{T}^2, r \in \mathbb{R}$, then the F

geodesics can be reparametrized into A_L-critical curves. This encoding of the geodesic flow ϕ_F^t in the Euler-Lagrange ϕ_L^t of L is related to constructing Poincaré surfaces of section for ϕ_F^t in $S_F\mathbb{T}^2$, namely consider

$$N_t := \{(x,v) \in S_F\mathbb{T}^2 : x_1 = t\}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

Set $\Xi := \{(x,v) \in S\mathbb{T}^2 : v_1 > 0\}$, then in Ξ the geodesic flow of F is transverse to all N_t and ϕ_F^t can be reparametrized into ϕ_L^t. The first return map

$$\varphi : N_0 \to N_0$$

is the time-1-map $\phi_L^1|_{\{0\}\times C}$ (putting questions as to where φ is defined aside). One can show that φ is a monotone twist map, if the geodesics in the domain of definition have no conjugate points before returning to N_0. In general, φ can be thought of as a composition of monotone twist maps.

Monotone twist maps come with a generating function $h : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. Letting F be the reversible Finsler metric associated to f as above, the function h is related to the distance d_F of F on $\mathbb{R}^2$ via

$$h(s,t) = d_F((0,s),(1,t)).$$

This is the approach in [Ban88]. In this way, minimal geodesics for F occur as action minimizers for f and vice versa. See also Lemma 4.2.5 in [Sib04]: a generating function of the first return map φ to N_0 above is given by the first-return time to Poincaré sections, while in Finsler geodesic flows, time equals length equals distance.

Using the above links, results on monotone twist maps correspond to results on geodesic flows on $\mathbb{T}^2$. However, there are differences. For instance, let $c : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ be A_L-critical and $(t, \tilde{c}(t))$ be the corresponding geodesic of the associated Finsler metric on $\mathbb{T}^2$, lifted to $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then $(t, \tilde{c}(t))$ cannot be recurrent in $\mathbb{R}^2$, where as Finsler metrics are allowed to have recurrent geodesics in the universal cover. This difference also appeared in Subsection 10.1.

11.2. **Tonelli Lagrangians.** Given a Finsler metric F on a closed manifold M, we can consider the kinetic energy given by $L_F = \frac{1}{2}F^2$. Apart from smoothness at the zero section, this is a good example of a Tonelli Lagrangian. Other classical examples are of the form

$$L(v) = \frac{1}{2}|v|_g^2 + \eta(v) + U(\pi(v)),$$

where g is some Riemannian metric, η a 1-form and $U : M \to \mathbb{R}$ some function on M.

Definition 11.1. *A* Tonelli Lagrangian *is a function $L : TM \to \mathbb{R}$, which is superlinear and strongly convex in the fibers T_xM of TM. A* Tonelli Hamiltonian *is a function $H : T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$ with the analogous properties.*

Given a Tonelli Lagrangian, its Fenchel transform is a Tonelli Hamiltonian, in much the same way that we associated to a Finsler metric F its dual Finsler metric F^* in Section 4. Basically all of the theory that we developed here has an analogon for Tonelli Lagrangian systems. We refer e.g. to [Sor10] and [Fat08] and the referenes therein. Just note for the moment, that L defines an action $A_L(c) = \int L(\dot{c})dt$ and an Euler-Lagrange flow $\phi_L^t : TM \to TM$ (for $L = L_F$ this is the geodesic flow). The Euler-Lagrange flow leaves the energy E_L invariant, given by

$$E_L := \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0} L(v + tv) - L(v).$$

It is thus natural to restrict the flow ϕ_L^t to $\{E_L = e\} \subset TM$. For $L = L_F$ and $e = 1/2$, this is the unit tangent bundle S_FM.

In Subsection 5.2 we already discussed Mather theory for $L = L_F$. The same works in the general case, i.e. we have Mather's average actions α_L, β_L. A particularly interesting value is given by

$$c_0(L) := \min \alpha_L,$$

called *Mañé's strict critical value*. This minimum exists, as α_L is convex and superlinear. For energies $e > c_0(L)$, we consider *Mañé's potential*

$$\Phi_{L+e}(x, y) := \inf \{A_L(c) \mid c : [0, T] \to H, c(0) = x, c(T) = y, T > 0\}$$

in the universal cover H of M. The generalizes the Finsler distance d_F in H for $L = L_F$. The action minimizers $c : \mathbb{R} \to H$ with respect to $L + e$, called *e-minimizers* will have energy e, so that Φ_{L+e} highlights the energy level $\{E_L = e\}$. Using Mañé's potential as a distance, one can develop all the theory in this paper.

There is a more direct link to Finsler metrics, which we recall now, see [CIPP98].

Theorem 11.2. *For $e > c_0(L)$, there exists a Finsler metric F on M, so that the Euler-Lagrange flow $\phi_L^t|_{\{E_L=e\}}$ is conjugated to the geodesic flow $\phi_F^t|_{S_FM}$. Mañé's potential in H is then given by $\Phi_{L+e}(x, y) = d_F(x, y) + f(y) - f(x)$ for a fixed function $f : H \to \mathbb{R}$. In particular, e-minimizers of L correspond to minimal F-geodesics.*

One idea for the proof is to use the associated Tonelli Hamiltonian $H : T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$ and the characterization of α_L given in Proposition 5.10 to show that the energy level $\{H = e\}$ is a sphere bundle. Then

take the dual Finsler metric $F^* : T^*M \to \mathbb{R}$ with $F^*|_{\{H=e\}} = 1$. Both Hamiltonians H and $\frac{1}{2}(F^*)^2$ share a level set, which means that the flows are conjugated.

11.3. **Symplectic geometry.** In the previous subsection, we generalized from Finslerian geodesic to Euler-Lagrange flows of Tonelli Lagrangians. Theorem 11.2 showed that for sufficiently large energies, the result was again a Finsler geodesic flow of some kind. A strictly more general setting is that of contact manifolds and Reeb flows in symplectic geometry. The understanding of minimal geodesics, being fundamental to the global behavior of geodesic flows, should eventually lead to results on the more general class of Reeb flows; this also concerns the question as to which phenomena are geometric and which are symplectic in nature.

Let us remark in this connection that it was shown by Bernard [Ber07], that Mather, Mañé and Aubry sets (see Section 5) behave well under symplectomorphisms. Moreover, observe that Proposition 5.10 leads already to a Hamiltonian characterization of the set $B^*(F) = \{\alpha_F \leq 1/2\}$, generalized by the symplectic shape of energy sublevel sets $\{\frac{1}{2}(F^*)^2 \leq 1/2\}$ in Chapter 6 of [Sib04]. Note that weak KAM solutions defining exact Lagrangian graphs are also known as generating functions in symplectic geometry. Much of the theory in this paper could be translated into these more general settings, and a lot is still under development.

Let us point out a more concrete question, as to what phenomena could be generalized from the setting of geodesic to Reeb flows. This concerns the results on geodesic flows on $\mathbb{T}^2$ with vanishing entropy, see Subsection 9.3.

Problem 11.3. *If $\phi^t : \mathbb{T}^3 \to \mathbb{T}^3 = \mathbb{T}^2 \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ is a Reeb flow associated to a tight contact form of degree $k \geq 1$ (see the classification of tight contact structures by Yutaka in* [Yut97]*: the contact structure is tangent to the fibers $\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and winds around these fibers k times) with $h_{\mathrm{top}}(\phi^t, \mathbb{T}^3) = 0$, do there exist for each $\xi \in \mathbb{S}^1$ k thickened invariant "graphs" (i.e. homologous to the "base" $B := \mathbb{T}^2 \times \{0\}$) $T_{\xi,i}, i = 1, ..., k$, such that the orbits in $T_{\xi,i}$, when projected to B, wind around B with asymptotic direction ξ (obtaining a structure similar to Figure 8)?*

Ideas for the proof. 1. The contact structure looks in some sense like the spherization (for $k = 1$), i.e. fillable, such that contact homological techniques could be used to show that for $i = 1, ..., k$ and each homotopy class $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ of B there exists a closed orbit $\gamma_{z,i}$ with homotopy class z (in fact: two, one minimum and one minimax of the

action functional), when projected to B. The idea for $k = 1$ is that the contact structure looks like the Liouville form in $T^*\mathbb{T}^2$ restricted to the boundary of a fiberwise starshaped set. The contact homology then "fibers through the contact homology of two contact homologies of flat Riemannian metrics on $\mathbb{T}^2$", cf. [FLS13]. These closed orbits give a first "frame" for invariant sets.

2. Generalize the results of Franks and Handel [FH12] to this situation (Reeb or more general flows). A key technique might be the notion of LeCalvez' maximally unlinked sets of closed orbits corresponding to the fixed-point sets in [FH12]. Namely all dynamics wind non-trivially around maximally unlinked sets by definition. Possibly one can then show as in [FH12] that there exists a continuous integral of the flow given by the homological rotation vector in the base B. □

References

[Ang92] S. Angenent – *A remark on the topological entropy and invariant circles of an area preserving twistmap*. IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications 44 (1992), 1-5.

[Ang08] S. Angenent – *Self-intersecting geodesics and entropy of the geodesic flow*. Acta Mathematica Sinica 24.12 (2008), 1949-1952.

[BM07] F. Balacheff, D. Massart – *Stable norms on non-orientable surfaces*. arXiv:0703667 [math.DG] (2007).

[Bal95] W. Ballmann – *Lectures on spaces of nonpositive curvature. With an appendix by Misha Brin*. DMV Seminar 25, Birkhäuser Verlag (1995).

[Ban88] V. Bangert – *Mather sets for twist maps and geodesics on tori*. Dynamics Reported 1 (1988), 1-56.

[Ban94] V. Bangert – *Geodesic rays, Busemann functions and monotone twist maps*. Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations 2.1 (1994), 49-63.

[BCS00] D. D.-W. Bao, S. S. Chern, Z. Shen – *An introduction to Riemann-Finsler geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 200, Springer Verlag (2000).

[Ber07] P. Bernard – *Symplectic aspects of Mather theory*. Duke Mathematical Journal 136.3 (2007), 401-420.

[BC08] P. Bernard, G. Contreras – *A generic property of families of Lagrangian systems*. Annals of Mathematics 167 (2008), 1099-1108.

[BL14] P. Bernard, C. Labrousse – *An entropic characterization of the flat metrics on the two torus*. arXiv:1406.0794 [math.DS] (2014).

[BP86] M. L. Bialy, L. V. Polterovich – *Geodesic flows on the two-dimensional torus and phase transitions 'commensurability-noncommensurability' (English translation)*. Functional Analysis and Its Applications 20 (1986), 260-266.

[BC88] S. A. Bleiler, A. J. Casson– *Automorphisms of surfaces after Nielsen and Thurston*. London Mathematical Society, Student Texts 9, Cambridge University Press (1988).

[BR02] S. V. Bolotin, P. H. Rabinowitz – *Some geometrical condition for the existence of chaotic geodesics on a torus*. Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems 22.5 (2002), 1407-1428.

[BF04] A. V. Bolsinov, A. T. Fomenko – *Integrable Hamiltonian Systems: Geometry, Topology, Classification*. CRC Press (2004).

[Bon06] M. Bonino – *Around Brouwer's theory of fixed point free planar homeomorphisms*. Notes de cours de l'École d'été "Méthodes topologiques en dynamique des surfaces" (Université Grenoble I, 2006), available online at `http://www.math.univ-paris13.fr/~bonino/travaux.html`.

[Boy00] P. Boyland – *New dynamical invariants on hyperbolic manifolds*. Israel Journal of Mathematics 119 (2000), 253-289.

[Bra15] B. Bramham – *Periodic approximations of irrational pseudo-rotations using pseudoholomorphic curves*. Annals of Mathematics 181.3 (2015), 1033-1086.

[BH99] M. R. Bridson, A. Haefliger – *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 319, Springer Verlag (1999).

[BI95] D. Burago, S. Ivanov – *On asymptotic volume of tori*. Geometric and Functional Analysis 5.5 (1995), 800-808.

[Bus55] H. Busemann – *The geometry of geodesics*. Academic Press Inc., New York (1955).

[CIPP98] G. Contreras, R. Iturriaga, G. P. Paternain, M. Paternain – *Lagrangian graphs, minimizing measures and Mañé's critical values*. Geometric and Functional Analysis 8.5 (1998), 788-809.

[CMP04] G. Contreras, L. Macarini, G. P. Paternain – *Periodic orbits for exact magnetic flows on surfaces*. International Mathematics Research Notices 2004.8 (2004), 361-387.

[CS14] Y. Coudéne, B. Schapira – *Generic measures for geodesic flows in non-positively curved manifolds*. Journal de l'École polythechnique 1 (2014), 387-408.

[Din71] E. I. Dinaburg – *On the relations among various entropy characteristics of dynamical systems*. Mathematics of the USSR-Izvestiya 5.2 (1971), 337-378.

[Don88] V. J. Donnay – *Geodesic flow on the two-sphere, part II: Ergodicity*. Dynamical Systems, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1342, Springer Verlag (1988), 112-153.

[EO'N73] P. Eberlein, B. O'Neill – *Visibility manifolds*. Pacific Journal of Mathematics 46.1 (1973), 45-109.

[Fat08] A. Fathi – *Weak KAM theorem in Lagrangian dynamics, preliminary version number 10*. Preprint (2008), available online at `http://www.math.u-bordeaux1.fr/~pthieull/Recherche/KamFaible/publications.html`.

[FH12] J. Franks, M. Handel – *Entropy zero area preserving diffeomorphisms of* $\mathbb{S}^2$. Geometry & Topology 16 (2012), 2187-2284.

[Fra92] J. Franks – *Geodesics on* $\mathbb{S}^2$ *and periodic points of annulus homeomorphisms*. Inventiones Mathematicae 108.2 (1992), 403-418.

[FLS13] U. Frauenfelder, C. Labrousse, F. Schlenk – *Slow volume growth for Reeb flows on spherizations and contact Bott-Samelson theorems*. arXiv:1307.7290v1 [math.DS] (2013).

[FM82] A. Freire, R. Mañé – *On the Entropy of the Geodesic Flow in Manifolds Without Conjugate Points*. Invent. math. 69 (1982), 375-392.

[Fur81] H. Furstenberg – *Recurrence in Ergodic Theory and Combinatorial Number Theory*. Princeton University Press (1981).

[GKOS14] E. Glasmachers, G. Knieper, C. Ogouyandjou, J. P. Schröder – *Topological entropy of minimal geodesics and volume growth on surfaces*. Journal of Modern Dynamics 8.1 (2014), 75-91.

[Gla07] E. Glasmachers – *Characterization of Riemannian metrics on $\mathbb{T}^2$ with and without positive topological entropy*. Dissertation, Ruhr-Universität Bochum (2007).

[GK10] E. Glasmachers, G. Knieper – *Characterization of geodesic flows on $\mathbb{T}^2$ with and without positive topological entropy*. Geometric and Functional Analysis 20 (2010), 1259-1277.

[GK11] E. Glasmachers, G. Knieper – *Minimal geodesic foliation on $\mathbb{T}^2$ in case of vanishing topological entropy*. Journal of Topology and Analysis 3.4 (2011), 1-10.

[Gol01] C. Golé – *Symplectic twist maps: global variational techniques*. Advanced Series in Nonlinear Dynamics 18, World Scientific (2001).

[Gra89] M. A. Grayson – *Shortening embedded curves*. Annals of Mathematics 129 (1989), 71-111.

[Gro81] M. Gromov – *Hyperbolic manifolds, groups and actions*. Riemann surfaces and related topics: Proceedings of the 1978 Stony Brook Conference 97 (1981).

[Hed32] G. A. Hedlund – *Geodesics on a two-dimensional Riemannian manifold with periodic coefficients*. The Annals of Mathematics 33.4 (1932), 719-739.

[HM42] G. A. Hedlund, H. M. Morse – *Manifolds without conjugate points*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 51 (1942), 362-386.

[Hop48] E. Hopf – *Closed surfaces without conjugate points*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 34.2 (1948), 47-51.

[Kat73] A. Katok – *Ergodic perturbations of degenerate integrable Hamiltonian systems*. Mathematics of the USSR-Izvestiya 7.3 (1973), 535-571.

[Kat80] A. Katok – *Lyapunov exponents, entropy and periodic orbits for diffeomorphisms*. Publications mathématiques de l'I.H.E.S. 51 (1980), 137-173.

[KH95] A. Katok, B. Hasselblatt – *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications 54, Cambridge University Press (1995).

[KS15] S. Klempnauer, J. P. Schröder – *The stable norm on the 2-torus at irrational directions*. arXiv:1512.02447 [math.DS] (2015).

[Kli71] W. Klingenberg – *Geodätischer Fluß auf Mannigfaltigkeiten vom hyperbolischen Typ*. Inventiones Mathematicae 14 (1971), 63-82.

[Kni95] G. Knieper – *Volume growth, entropy and the geodesic stretch*. Mathematical Research Letters 2 (1995), 39-58.

[Kni98] G. Knieper – *The uniqueness of the measure of maximal entropy for rank 1 manifolds*. Annals of Mathematics 148.2 (1998), 291-314.

[KO11] M. Kunze, R. Ortega – *Twist mappings with non-periodic angles*. To appear as CIME lecture notes, program 'Stability and bifurcation for non-autonomous differential equations', Cetraro (2011).

[Man79] A. Manning – *Topological entropy for geodesic flows*. Annals of Mathematics 110.3 (1979), 567-573.

[Mat88] J. N. Mather – *Destruction of Invariant Circles*. Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems 8 (1988), 199-214.

[Mat90] J. N. Mather – *Differentiability of the minimal average action as a function of the rotation number*. Boletim da Sociadade Brasileira de Matemática 21.1 (1990), 59-70.

[Mat91a] J. N. Mather – *Variational construction of orbits of twist diffeomorphisms*. Journal of the American Mathematical Society 4.2 (1991), 207-263.

[Mat91b] J. N. Mather – *Action minimizing measures for positive definite Lagrangian systems*. Mathematische Zeitschrift 207.1 (1991), 169-207.

[Mañ96] R. Mañé – *Generic properties and problems of minimizing measures of Lagrangian systems*. Nonlinearity 9 (1996), 273-310.

[Mas96] D. Massart – *Normes stables des surfaces*. Thése de doctorat, Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon (1996).

[Mas97] D. Massart – *Stable norms of surfaces: local structure of the unit ball at rational directions*. GAFA 7 (1997), 996-1010.

[Mas03] D. Massart – *On Aubry sets and Mather's action functional*. Israel Journal of Mathematics 134 (2003), 157-171.

[MS11] D. Massart, A. Sorrentino – *Differentiability of Mather's average action and integrability on closed surfaces*. Nonlinearity 24.6 (2011), 1777-1793.

[Mas15] D. Massart – *Erratum to "On Aubry sets and Mather's action functional", Israel Journal of Mathematics 134 (2003), 157-171*. Israel Journal of Mathematics 207 (2015), 1001.

[Mor24] H. M. Morse – *A fundamental class of geodesics on any closed surface of genus greater than one*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 26.1 (1924), 25-60.

[Mos86] J. Moser – *Monotone twist mappings and the calculus of variations*. Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems 6.3 (1986), 401-413.

[Neu77] W. D. Neumann – *Generalizations of the Poincaré Birkhoff fixed point theorem*. Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. 17 (1977), 375-389.

[Pat91] G. P. Paternain – *Entropy and completely integrable Hamiltonian systems*. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 113.3 (1991), 871-873.

[Rug97] R. O. Ruggiero – *Flatness of Gaussian curvature and area of ideal triangles*. Boletim da Sociadade Brasileira de Matemática 28.1 (1997), 73-87.

[Sch13] J. P. Schröder – *Tonelli Lagrangians on the 2-torus : global minimizers, invariant tori and topological entropy*. Dissertation, Ruhr-Universität Bochum (2013).

[Sch15a] J. P. Schröder – *Global minimizers for Tonelli Lagrangians on the 2-torus*. Journal of Topology and Analysis 7.2 (2015), 261-291.

[Sch15b] J. P. Schröder – *Invariant tori and topological entropy in Tonelli Lagrangian systems on the 2-torus*. Preprint (2015), to appear in Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems.

[Sch15c] J. P. Schröder – *Ergodicity and topological entropy of geodesic flows on surfaces*. Journal of Modern Dynamics 9 (2015), 147-167.

[Sch15d] J. P. Schröder – *Minimal rays on closed surfaces*. Preprint (2015), to appear in Israel Journal of Mathematics.

[Sch15e] J. P. Schröder – *Generic uniqueness of shortest closed geodesics*. Preprint (2015), arXiv:1405.2756 [math.DG].

[Sib04] K. F. Siburg – *The principle of least action in geometry and dynamics*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1844, Springer Verlag (2004).

[Sor10] A. Sorrentino – *Lecture notes on Mather's theory for Lagrangian systems*. arXiv: 1011.0590 [math.DS] (2010).

[Wu13] W. Wu – *On the ergodicity of geodesic flows on surfaces of non-positive curvature*. arXiv:1309.6539v3 [math.DS] (2013)

[Yut97] K. Yutaka – *The classification of tight contact structures on the 3-torus*. Communications in Analysis and Geometry 5.3 (1997), 413-438.

[Zau62] E. M. Zaustinsky – *Extremals on compact E-surfaces*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 102.3 (1962), 433-445.

Faculty of Mathematics, Ruhr University, 44780 Bochum, Germany
E-mail address: jan.schroeder-a57@rub.de
http://www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/ffm/Lehrstuehle/Lehrstuhl-X/jan.html